BX 5037 .J3 1844 v.10
Jackson, Thomas, 1579-1640.
The works of Thomas Jackson,
D. D.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/worksofthomasjac10jack

THE WORKS

OF

THOMAS JACKSON, D.D.

SOMETIME

PRESIDENT OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD,

AND DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

A NEW EDITION, IN TWELVE VOLUMES,
WITH A COPIOUS INDEX.

VOLUME X.

OXFORD:
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
MDCCCXLIV.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.

COMMENTARIES UPON THE CREED.

BOOK XI.

SECTION I. 309

Of Christ's sitting at the right Hand of God. Of the grammatical Sense of the Words, and of the real Dignity answering thereto.

CHAP. I.

Of the grammatical Sense of the Words, and whether they be merely metaphorical.

HEBREWS X. 12, 13.

But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool.

1. ALBEIT the right hand be more worthy than the left, yet some (rather desirous to shew their reading than to edify their readers or hearers) have made question, whether it be a note of greater dignity to have place on the left hand or on the right, near to the fountain of honour or supreme majesty. But all the instances which they bring, or can be brought, for pre-eminence of place on the left hand, are but as calendars out of date, or as astronomical observations purposed for eastern meridians, but misapplied to them of the

west. Whatever the rites or fashions of other nations were, the church of God, or land of Jury, in which God was only known, had no such custom. Now the tenor of this prerogative here mentioned must be valued by the scales of the sanctuary, not by the heraldry of foreign courts. Even in those countries wherein the attendance on the left hand of princes was more honourable than on the right, the only ground of the subject's power or dignity so attending was the imbecility of the prince, who ordinarily could not defend himself so well on the left side as on the right. And as our uncomely parts have more comeliness bestowed upon them, so the weaker side of greatest princes had more need of valorous and trusty champions. And though princes in all ages have been prone to honour and grace their special favourites with place of more honourable attendance, yet the warlike princes of ancient times made choice of men most trusty and valorous for their favourites. But the Almighty, unto whose future designs the rites and customs of the kings of Judah were (haply) prefashioned, needs no defendant, no assistant, either on the right hand or on the left. The former occasion of imbecility, or need of defendants, being set apart, as the right hand is ordinarily more worthy than the left, so to be on the right hand of supreme honour is simply more honourable than to be on the left, specially according to the custom of the Jews. The sons of Zebedee, or their mother, or both, were not ignorant in respect of the general matter, but in the particular form or manner or circumstance of their petition, when they desired that *the one might sit on their Master's right hand, and the other on the left, in his kingdom.* To sit by him in his kingdom,
310 was, to their apprehension, and according to the custom of their native country, a greater dignity than to stand

by him, or to go in and out before him. To sit on the right hand was affected by the mother as a place of precedence for her elder son, and therefore ranked in the former place in her petition [a]. She saith not, *that the one may sit on the left hand, and the other on the right;* but, *that one may sit on the right hand, and the other on the left.* Matt. xx. 21. That to sit on the right hand of majesty was the greatest honour whereof any subject or inferior prince in Jury was capable, may be gathered from the honour which Solomon did unto his mother Bath-sheba, 1 Kings ii. 19: *The king rose up to meet her, and bowed himself unto her, and sat down on his throne, and caused a seat to be set for the king's mother; and she sat on his right hand.* Nor hath the royal psalmist any better place for the spouse whose dignity he sought to emblazon, psalm xlv. 9: *Kings' daughters were among thy honourable women: upon thy right hand did stand the queen in a vesture of gold of Ophir.* To have the power of superiors on the right hand, or for the enemy to have the right hand, is in sacred heraldry a sign of victory or preeminence, whether in civil or warlike proceedings. The greatest plague and root of curses which David did wish unto the enemies of his God, and which did afterwards fall on Judas, the greatest enemy of David's Son and Lord, was, that *the wicked might be set over him*, and that *the adversary might stand at his right hand;* for so he knew that he should *be condemned, when he was judged*, and that *his prayers should be turned into sin.* Psalm cix. 6, 7. The surest anchor of David's confidence was God's being on his right hand, psalm xvi. 8: *The Lord is at my right hand, therefore I shall not slide* or *fall.* And the final consummation of all the happiness which he hoped for, whether

[a] See Gen. xlviii. 13, 14, 17.

in his own person or in the person of his expected Son the Messias, was, to be placed at the right hand of God: *In thy presence is fulness of joy; and at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore.* Psalm xvi. 11. And so will it be found at the last day, when the Son of man *shall set the sheep on his right hand, and the goats on the left: and shall say to them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed..... But to them on the left, Go, ye cursed.....* Matt. xxv. 33, &c.

2. So then, this article of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God is as a trophy of his victory gotten over death, and over all the temptations of the world and the devil, whilst he lived on earth; and a certain prognostic of his final triumph over all his succeeding enemies: for he must *sit at the right hand of God until all his enemies be made his footstool.* But before we come to decipher the real dignity here described, it may be questioned whether the description itself be merely metaphorical or symbolical; that is, a language borrowed from the visible customs of men, without any real sensible similitude between the things signified by the same words. That this phrase of *sitting at the right hand of God* is a mere borrowed speech, most divines do hold; giving us withal this general rule: that no corporeal substance, quality, habit, or gesture, can be attributed unto God otherwise than ἀνθρωποπαθῶς, that is, by a kind of poetical fiction, or figurative speech, borrowed from the fashions of men. The proper logical subject, notwithstanding, of this rule or maxim, must be the Godhead, or divine nature in the abstract: it holds not so truly of God, or at least of every divine person. The divine nature or Godhead is simple, pure, and immixt: the Godhead hath neither eyes nor ears nor body, much less can there be in it any distinction of right hand or left; yet may we not

deny but the Son of God, who is truly God, hath eyes and ears, feet and hands, right hand and left hand, and 311
all the parts of the human body, which any perfect man hath. His blood, though human blood, is as truly the blood of God as of man. His blood is the blood of God, his body the body of God, in such a sense, as neither the body nor blood of any other creature are said to be God's, whose all things are in heaven and earth. His flesh and blood, and all the parts of his human body, are the flesh, blood, and parts of God in as strict and proper sense, as our hands are said our own; that is, by strict and personal propriety. The Son of God hath flesh and blood, hands and feet, in such a sense as God the Father or God the Holy Ghost hath not.

3. But when it is said that "Christ sitteth at the right hand of God," this must be understood of God the Father, not of God the Son, for so it is expressed in the Apostles' Creed, that "the Son of God, who was crucified, dead, and buried, and who rose the third day from the dead, now sits at the right hand of God the Father Almighty." Now if God the Father hath no body, no right hand or left hand, as God the Son hath, the case seems clear, that Christ's sitting at the right hand of the Father must needs be a speech merely metaphorical, borrowed from the custom of earthly princes, to be placed at whose right hand is the greatest honour that can be to their chief peers or subjects. This is most certain, if we speak of the nature or essence of the Godhead, or of the divine person of the Father. Yet all this hinders not, why the Divine Majesty, or person of the Father, who is every where essentially present, may not be more conspicuously present (in respect of created sights) in some visible heavenly throne than in any other place. The Father

It is probable that there are distinct thrones in heaven.

(for aught we know) may have a distinct throne, and the Son another, or they may have distinct manifestations of glory upon the same throne, Rev. iii. 21. To confine the presence of God the Father, of God the Son, or of God the Holy Ghost, to any visible throne, were a gross heresy. But that there may be real emblems or representations of the blessed Trinity in heaven, as conspicuous and sensible to blessed saints and angels, as the representations which have been made of them to God's saints or people here on earth, who can conceive improbable? The representations or pledges of the blessed Trinity have been divers. Daniel saw the glory of the Father shadowed by the Ancient of days, the glory of the Son represented by the similitude of the Son of man. At our Saviour's baptism there was *a voice from heaven,* as an audible testimony of the distinct person of the Father; Christ as man, was the conspicuous seat or throne of God the Son; and the dove, which appeared unto John, a visible pledge of the Holy Ghost. And may not the church triumphant have as punctual representations or pledges of this distinction no less sensible, though more admirable, than the church militant hath had here on earth?

4. It is not then altogether so clear, that this title, of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God the Father, is borrowed from the rites or customs of the kings of Judah, as it is questionable, whether this rite or custom amongst them were not framed after the pattern of the heavenly thrones or representations of celestial dignities; so we know the earthly sanctuary was framed according to the pattern of the heavenly sanctuary. *Our fathers had the tabernacle of witness in the wilderness, as he had appointed, speaking unto Moses, that he should make it according to the fashion that he had seen.* Acts vii. 44. Exod. xxv. 40. And our

apostle saith, Heb. viii. 5: Those served *unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for, See, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern shewed to thee in the mount.* But it may be, the pattern shewed to him in 312
the mount was but a show or mathematical draught of the material tabernacle which he was to erect; and yet is styled an *heavenly pattern*, or *heavenly thing*, because it was represented from heaven by God himself; yet so represented without any real tabernacle answerable to it in heaven. I could subscribe to this interpretation, if the apostle's inference, Heb. ix. 23, 24, did not prove or presuppose something more: *It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves (are purified) with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us.* But hath he the whole heavens for his sanctuary? or is there as real a distinction of places or mansions in the heavens, as there was of courts or sanctuaries in the material, or in Solomon's temple? *We have such an high priest*, saith St. Paul, *who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens;* and is *a minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man*[b]; and, Eph. i. 20, *The Father of glory set him at his own right hand, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, in the heavenly places.* Some distinction between the *throne of Majesty* and Christ's humanity was apprehended surely by St. Stephen, Acts vii. 55: *He, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up stedfastly into heaven, and*

[b] Heb. viii. 1, 2.

saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God: the object of his sight was surely real, not a mere vision in the air, for *he saw the heavens open*, and by their opening found opportunity to pry with bodily eyes (but bodily eyes extraordinarily enlightened by the Spirit of God) into heaven itself, and to take a view of the land of promise, and the sanctuary pitched in it. The divine essence, or person of God the Father, he could not see; and yet *he saw the glory of God*, and *Christ at the right hand* of this glory. But he saw Christ *standing*, and not *sitting*, as here it is said. All is one; it is the height of Christ's exaltation, that he hath the preeminence to sit upon his throne in the immediate presence of God the Father's glorious throne. But this prerogative of sitting upon his throne doth not tie him to such perpetual residence, that he may not stand when it pleaseth him; and it seems it was at this time this great Judge's pleasure to stand, as a spectator of his blessed martyr's combat, and for the present, as a witness against these his malicious enemies, which afterward were to be made his footstool. Now was that of the psalmist, psalm cii. 19, verified—*He hath looked down from the height of his sanctuary; from heaven did the Lord behold the earth.*

5. But if Christ have a visible throne or sanctuary in heaven, how is it true which St. Stephen saith, Acts vii. 48—50: *The most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands; as saith the prophet, Heaven is my throne, and earth is my footstool: what house will ye build me? saith the Lord: or what is the place of my rest? hath not my hand made all these things?* And if God dwell not in any sanctuary which he hath made, how can he have any visible sanctuary in heaven? For even the heaven of heavens,

every creature, whether visible or invisible, are the works of God's hands. To this the answer is easy: When the prophet saith, *God dwelleth not in temples made with hands*, he excludeth only the works of men's hands, not all created thrones or sanctuaries made immediately by God himself[c]. For, as the apostle saith, Heb. viii. 2, *Christ is a minister of the sanctuary, which the Lord hath pitched, and not man:* and, Heb. ix. 11, *Christ being come a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building*, &c. Thus much of the grammatical or 313
literal meaning of these words. As for this opinion of distinction of thrones in heaven, as I dare not boldly avouch it, so I am afraid peremptorily to deny it. For peremptory negatives in divine mysteries ofttimes sway more dangerously unto infidelity, than affirmative paradoxes do to heresy. The affirmative, in this mystery, is (in my opinion) more safe and probable than the negative. However, the point, which all of us are bound absolutely to believe, is, that this article, of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God, doth contain the height of his exaltation, *far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.* Eph. i. 21. Ὁ Θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσε, *God*, saith the apostle, Phil. ii. 9, 10, *also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow* .... &c. And seeing every other article in this Creed is conceived in literal distinct terms, I see no reason why we should believe this article (of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God) alone should be represented unto us in terms poetical, or merely

[c] See Mr. Mede, Places appropriate.

metaphorical. Howbeit, Christ's sitting at the right hand of God the Father, according to the literal meaning of these words, doth by way of real emblem import, that Christ's human nature is exalted far above angels, &c., which are often said to *stand* or *attend* before or about the throne of God, but not to sit on his throne, or at his right hand. *For unto which of them said he at any time, Sit on my right hand . . . .?* Heb. i. 13.

CHAP. II.

Of the real Dignity contained in this Article, viz. the Exaltation of Christ; that Christ was exalted, both as the Son of God, and as the Son of David.

1. THE dignity of this name, and the reality of dignity answering unto it, is further set forth in the first chapter to the Hebrews, vv. 3—5: *He* (*sat down,* or) *sitteth on the right hand of the Majesty on high* (or *in highest places*); *being made so much better than the angels, as he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? and again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?* But if these two scriptures were literally meant, as most divines grant, the one of David, the other of Solomon, why may not the title of *God's sons* agree as literally to angels as to David or Solomon? Though these two eminent princes, as God's vicegerents on earth, were *solo Deo minores*, yet was David in the height of his greatness too low, and Solomon, in the amplitude of his royalty, too little, to be (in all points) full peers to the meanest angel that attends God's throne. And yet were not both of them too great to be but maps or models of evangelical excellencies. It was the height of both

their excellencies to be shadows or types of that Son of David, concerning whom the Lord had *sworn by his holiness*, (a most faithful oath, from which he would not shrink, psalm cxxxii. 11, and psalm lxxxix. 3, 4, 35, 36,) that he *should endure stable for ever, and that his throne should be as faithful a witness in heaven as either sun or moon. Selah.* All the royalty, power, or prosperity, which David or Solomon enjoyed, were but as pledges or earnests for the time present of that mighty power and excellency wherewith the Son of David was (after that in the fulness of time he had humbled himself) in the fulness of glory to be invested. But as we say *Homo pictus est homo*, and no man 314
saith *Leo vivus est homo;* a dead corpse or picture of man doth better brook the name of man, than a live lion or other creature endued with sense; so David and Solomon, in that they were types of Christ, might be more capable of being styled *God's sons*, or of being begotten to that earthly empire which was the map or shadow of his only begotten Son's eternal inheritance, than the angels were. The greatest angels of God (whose presence David did reverence as God's ambassadors) are servants to the Son of David. For so the apostle, Heb. i. 6, interprets that of psalm xcvii. 7: *Let all the angels of God worship him.* No marvel then if David (when he saw as much of his glory as he or some other psalmist, psalm xcvii, did) instyle him *his Lord*, psalm cx. 1. That all the glory and dignity, which the apostle seeks to set forth by the testimony of the psalmist, psalm xlv. 6, 7, psalm cii. 25, 26, is comprehended in this article of 'Christ's sitting at the right hand of God,' the apostle supposeth, Heb. i. 13, 14. For so he concludes, by way of an epiphonema, (the sum of all which he had said before,) *Unto which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right*

hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation? It is a doctrine full of comfort, that the blessed angels, the powers and principalities celestial, one and other, should be at the command of this our High Priest, who can compassionate our estate much better than any of them can. As they had a *charge* given concerning him in the days of his humiliation here on earth; so he now, being ascended up to his Father, gives them the same *charge* over us, *to preserve us in all our ways.* It is on our part required, that we make his ways our ways, otherwise we have no just assurance of the angels' vigilancy over us. But have they this charge over all of us? or only over some few that are predestinated unto salvation? The apostle saith, *All of them are sent forth to minister to such as shall be heirs of salvation;* and all of us, whom God hath called and made partakers of his word and sacraments, are under the promise, and in the estate of the sons of God; and *if we be sons, then are we heirs;* yet *hæredes præsumpti, non apparentes*—heirs presumed, not heirs apparent unto salvation. To be heirs apparent, is proper to the predestinate only, or to the elect. But of the doctrine and use concerning angelical protection, and ministry for our good, elsewhere. It shall suffice to give you notice by the way, that this last quoted place, Heb. i. 14, doth evidently refute a curious distinction of orders amongst the angels, as if some were *angeli astantes*, others *ministrantes;* one order of angels that *stand in the presence of God*, because the angel Gabriel gives himself this title, Luke i. 19; and another order of *ministering* angels: whereas our apostle's speech is general, that *all the angels* (and under this universality he comprehends even the most noble order of heavenly

creatures) *are ministering spirits, sent forth for our good.* If they which are said in scripture to *stand before God*, be either angels or created substances, inferior to the Son of God, they are sometimes, at least by courses, *ministrantes*—ministering spirits. So that *to stand before God*, or *to minister for our good*, is no true note of any distinction of order betwixt angels, but only of the vicissitude of their service. They which are to be *sent forth*, *stand in the presence of God* to receive their instructions, and at their return, stand before God to deliver the effect or issue of their embassage [d].

2. But as divers writers in the Romish church, not balancing other places of scripture with this place of our apostle last cited, have framed a needless distinction of orders amongst the angels; so some others, opposite enough to them, offend no less by weighing 315
this place alone. For so far hath the misapprehended doctrine of predestination, and certainty of their own estate in salvation, missuaded some, as they have not been afraid to affirm, "that the angels are in some sort inferior to themselves, because they minister to them as they are heirs of salvation [e]." Ministers they are indeed, yet not to us, but to God or Christ, though for our good; so is every magistrate, so is every pastor in his place; yet God forbid that inferiors should hence collect, that their magistrates and pastors should be inferior to all them for whose good they are ministers.

3. The next point to be examined is, the extent of this our High Priest's exaltation; about the bounds or limits whereof, the controversies are more than any difficulties in the rule of faith do minister; (but not so many as men of rash and audacious understandings

[d] Job i. 6. [e] See Mr. Mede upon 1 Cor. iv. 1.

make;) and the most of them prosecuted with greater vehemency of contention, than the spirit of sobriety, which should be in every good Christian, will approve. The questions of more profitable use are generally two; the first concerns the logical subject of Christ's exaltation, comprehended in this title of *sitting at the right hand of God*, and the like; and the issue is this, 'Whether Christ be exalted only as he is the Son of David, or as he is the Son of God? or according to both his natures, as well divine as human?' The second query is about the extent or limits of the exaltation of his human nature. The one question, as logicians speak, is about the extent or limit of the subject; the other, about the extent or limit of the attribute. That Christ was exalted according to his human nature, or as he was the Son of David, all Christians agree: but that he should be exalted as God, or according to his divine nature, which is absolutely infinite, may well seem impossible for the matter, and for the phrase very harsh. Howbeit this is avouched by many orthodoxal and worthy divines. And if Christ be, as most protestants avouch, our Mediator, *secundum utramque naturam*, "according to both natures," why may he not be said to be exalted according to both natures? Yet a difference there is, which will disjoint this consequence; for to be a mediator betwixt two, doth not necessarily include any defect or inequality in the party mediating, in respect of the parties between whom he is a mediator. Whereas to be exalted doth necessarily include, or presuppose, some lower degree, from which he is exalted to an higher. And if Christ, according to his divine nature, be always equal to God the Father, he was, and is, and shall be absolutely infinite. And absolute infinity cannot admit of any degrees, specially of exaltation. This necessarily

Christ was exalted according to both natures.

argues, that Christ's divine nature could in itself receive no degree of diminution or exaltation. If then according to his divine nature he was exalted, this exaltation was not by any real addition of dignity to his nature, but only *quoad nos*, "in respect of us." And it is (perhaps) one thing to say, that Christ was exalted according to his divine nature; another to say, that Christ was exalted as he was the Son of God. However, thus much we are bound to believe, and thus much we may safely say, That Christ as God was exalted in the same sense or manner that he was humbled as God. Now, that the Son of God, who was as truly God as God the Father, truly equal to God the Father, did truly *humble himself unto death, even to the death of the cross*, was, in the first chapter of our eighth book, deduced out of the Second to the Philippians. Nor did he humble himself only according to his human nature, for *he humbled himself*, not only by his life and death here on earth, but by taking the human nature, in which he was humbled. The 316
human nature could not be humbled by being united to his divine nature, but rather exalted. So that the first and prime subject of his humiliation was, if not his divine nature, yet his divine person. The person of the Son of God was humbled by his incarnation or conception, by his birth, by his life, by his death and passion. And for every degree of his humiliation, there is a correspondent degree of his exaltation, by his resurrection, by his ascension into heaven, and by his sitting at the right hand of God the Father. In what sense our apostle saith he was *humbled* according to his divine person hath been discussed at large before. The sum was this: If he, that *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, had been at any time pleased to have assumed a body or created substance

into the unity of his infinite person, such glory and honour was unto that his body or created substance due, as exceeds the glory and honour of all other bodies or created substances, infinitely more than any creature can possibly exceed another. And yet we know that the Son of God, who was from eternity equal to his Father, did in the fulness of time assume into the unity of his Divine Person a body and soul subject to all the infirmities (sin only excepted) that human nature is capable of; and by assuming such a body, and by exposing it to all the miseries of mortality, the Son of God was truly said to be humbled: and the degrees of his humiliation were as many and large, as are the degrees by which his immortal glorified body doth exceed his mortal body; as many and large as are the degrees of honour and excellency betwixt that royal priesthood which now he exerciseth, and *the form of a servant* wherein he appeared. So that not only the human nature of the Son of God, but the Son of God in his human nature, is truly exalted according to all the degrees of his former humiliation. But is this all that we are bound to believe, or may safely acknowledge concerning the exaltation of Christ, both as he was the Son of God, and as he was the Son of David?

4. If this were all, then his exaltation as the Son of God should merely consist in the abdication or putting off the form of a servant. It could not include or presuppose any positive ground of any new and real attribute, but only a relation to his former humiliation. Some good divines (as well ancient as modern) suppose, that albeit man had never sinned, yet should the Son of God have been incarnate; that is, have taken our nature upon him; yet our nature not humbled, or obnoxious to death, but always clothed with glory and immortality. For illustration or example sake;

suppose that the Son of God had taken a human body altogether as glorious as now it is from the very first moment of its assumption into the unity of his divine glorious person, could the assumption of such a body, how glorious soever, or how perpetual soever its glory had been, have added any least degree of exaltation unto the Son of God? It could not. There had been indeed an exaltation of the body so assumed, but none of the nature or person assuming it. How then is the Son of God said now to be exalted, by his bodily ascension into heaven, or by his sitting at the right hand of the Father in our nature, wherein he was formerly humbled? Take the resolution plainly thus: God the Father had remained as glorious as now he is, although he had never created the world. For the creation gave much, even all they had, to things created; it gave nothing unto God, who was in being infinite; yet if God had created nothing, the attribute of Creator could have had no real ground, it had been no real attribute. In like manner, suppose the Son of God had never condescended to take our nature upon him, he had remained as glorious in his nature and 317
person as now he is; yet not glorified for or by this title or attribute of *incarnation*. Or suppose he had not *humbled himself unto death*, by taking the form of a servant upon him, he had remained as glorious in his nature and person, and in the attribute of incarnation, as now he is; but without these glorious attributes of being our Lord and Redeemer, and of being the Fountain of grace and salvation unto us. All these are real attributes, and suppose a real ground or foundation; and that was, *his humbling himself unto death, even unto the death of the cross*. Nor are these attributes only real, but more glorious, both in respect of God the Father, who was pleased to give his only

Son for us, and in respect of God the Son, who was pleased to pay our ransom by his humiliation, than the attribute of creation is. The Son of God then, not the Son of David only, hath been exalted since his death to be our Lord, by a new and real title, by the title of redemption and salvation. This is the sum of our apostle's inference concerning our Saviour's exaltation, Phil. ii. 11: *That every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.* To shut up this point; though Christ Jesus be both our High Priest and Lord, not only as he is the Son of David, but as he is the only-begotten Son of God, and so begotten from all eternity; yet was he neither begotten a Priest nor Lord from all eternity, but *made a Priest* and *made a Lord* in time: *The word of the oath*, saith the apostle, Heb. vii. 28, *which was since the law, maketh the Son a priest, who was consecrated for evermore.* And in the very same chapter wherein this *word of the oath*, or uncontrollable fiat for making the eternal Word an everlasting Priest, is contained, this peculiar title of *Lord* is first inferred: for so psalm cx. begins, *Jehovah said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.* Not that *Adonai* importeth less honour or majesty than *Jehovah* doth, as the Jews and Arians ignorantly and impiously collect; but with purpose to notify, that this title of *Lord*, or *Adonai*, was to become as peculiar to Jehovah the Son of God, as the title of *cohen* or *priest*. But this title of *Lord*, as peculiar to Christ, will require, and doth well deserve, a peculiar discourse; and the place allotted it is in the beginning of the second section.

5. Now for use or application these ensuing meditations and considerations offer themselves. What branch of sorrow, of bodily affliction, or anguish of

soul or spirit, can we imagine incident to any degree, condition, or sort of men, to any son of man at any time, unto which the waters of comfort may not plentifully be derived from this inexhaustible fountain of comfort, comprised in this article of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God the Father Almighty? No man can be of so low, dejected, or forlorn estate, for means or friends, *re* or *spe*, either by birth or by misfortune, but may raise his heart with this consideration, that it is no servitude or beggary, but freedom or riches, to be truly entitled a servant to the Lord of lords and King of kings; to whom *angels and principalities*, as St. Peter speaks, (even those angels and principalities, to whom not kings and monarchs, but even kingdoms and monarchies are pupils,) are subject, and his fellow-servants. Or in case any poor dejected soul should be surprised with distrust or jealousy, lest his Lord, in such infinite height of exaltation and distance, should not from heaven take notice of him thrown down to earth, let him to his comfort consider, that the Son of God and Lord of glory (to the end he might assure us, that he was not a Lord more great in himself than gracious and loving unto us) was pleased for a long time to become a servant before he would be made a Lord; and a servant subject to mul- 318
titudes of public despites, disgraces, and contempts, from which ordinary servants or men of forlorn hopes are freed. If he willingly became such a servant for thee, to whom he owed nothing, wilt not thou resolve to make a virtue of necessity, by patient bearing thy meanness or misfortunes for his sake, to whom even kings owe themselves, their sceptres, and all their worldly glory? But though it be a contemplation full of comfort to have him for our supreme Lord and Protector, who sometimes was a servant cruelly

oppressed by the greatest powers on earth, without any power of man to defend or protect him; yet the sweet streams of joy and comfort flow more plentifully to all sorts and conditions of men from the attribute of his royal priesthood. To be a priest, implies as much as to be a mediator or intercessor for averting God's wrath, or an advocate for procuring his favours and blessings[f]. And what could Comfort herself wish more for her children, (suppose she had been our mother,) than to have him for our perpetual advocate and intercessor at the right hand of God, who is equal to God in glory, in power, and immortality, and yet was sometimes more than equal unto us in all manner of anguish, of grievances and afflictions, that either our nature, state, or casual condition of life can be charged with! Albeit[g] he knew no sin, yet never was the heart of any the most grievous sinner—no, not whilst it melted with penitent tears and sorrow for misdoings past—so deeply touched with the fellow-feeling of his brother's miseries, of such miseries as were the proper effects or fruits of sin, as the heart of this our High Priest was touched with every man's misery and affliction, that presented himself with prayers unto him; his heart was as fit a receptacle for others' sorrows of all sorts, as the eye is of colours. *Who was weak, and he was not weak? who was grieved, and he burned not?* who was afflicted, and he not tormented?

6. There be two more special and remarkable maxims of our apostle's for our comfort; the one, Heb. ii. 10, that Christ was consecrated to his priesthood through afflictions, and consecrated through afflictions more than ordinary, through the sufferings of death and

[f] See book 8. chap. 15. [vol. vii. p. 511.

[g] See book 8. chap. 11. [vol. vii. p. 457.]

torments more than natural [h], to the end that being thus consecrated he *might become a merciful and faithful high priest;* a priest not only able to sanctify our afflictions to us, but to consecrate and anoint us through patient suffering of afflictions, to be *more than conquerors,* even *kings and priests to our God.* So he saith, Rev. iii. 21: *To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne.* The other remarkable speech of our apostle is, Heb. v. 8, *Albeit he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.* Being infinite in knowledge as he was God, and of most perfect knowledge as he was man, he could learn nothing by conversing here on earth with men, but only experience of godly grief and sorrows for our follies and impieties. Such sorrows were the proper fruits of our sins: we brought them forth, and he did taste the bitterness of them. This then is our comfort, that whatsoever he could learn on earth, he cannot possibly forget in heaven; we have, and ever shall have him, whilst he is in heaven and we on earth, an High Priest which will be touched with compassion of our miseries. The end of his coming down from heaven, and his investiture in *the form of a servant,* was, that he might be *consecrated through afflictions* here on earth to be *a merciful and faithful high priest,* and *mediator between God and man.* And this consecration, which was the end of his coming down, being accomplished, the end of his ascension into heaven, and of his sitting at the right hand of God, in our nature, was, that he might make intercession for us, out of the fresh and never 319
failing memory and experience of his own former grief and sorrows for our sins. And what good thing

[h] See book 8. chap. 14. [vol. vii. p. 502.]

is it then which he will not ask of his Father for us? And what is it that our heavenly Father, for his sake, will not give us? Nothing in heaven or earth, if we ask it in faith, and as we ought.

CHAP. III.

In what Sense Christ's human Nature may, in what Sense it may not be said to be infinitely exalted. The Question concerning the Ubiquity of Christ's Body handled.

1. THE article of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God, in the construction which all make of it, contains the height of his exaltation. And highly exalted he was; if not according to both natures, the divine as well as the human, yet as properly exalted as he was the Son of God as in that he was the Son of David. When we say he was truly exalted and truly humbled as he was the Son of God, our meaning is, that the true and prime subject, as of his humiliation, so of his exaltation, was not only his human nature, but his divine person[i]. Yet when we say that his divine person was the proper subject of his humiliation and exaltation, we mean, as we say in the schools, *subjectum attributionis*, not *subjectum inhæsionis*. His humiliation and exaltation are real attributes, and the proper subject of these real attributes was not only his human nature, but at the least his divine person. Yet are they really attributed to him without any real alteration, or internal change, either in his divine nature or person. His divine person was not lessened in itself by his humiliation, nor was it augmented in itself by his exaltation; and yet it was really humbled and really exalted.

2. His human nature is not only the true and

[i] See book 8. chap. 1. [vol. vii. p. 380.]

proper subject of his exaltation, but it is withal *subjectum inhæsionis:* his exaltation in it, or according to it, includes a true and real change in itself, not only in respect of us, or of the titles which we attribute or ascribe unto it: his human nature in his humiliation was clothed with mortality, as with its inner garment, and had the form of a servant as an outward vesture upon it. In his exaltation he put off both, and clothed the human nature with his immortality; and covered and adorned his immortal nature with the robes of endless glory and majesty. This real alteration and internal change all do grant. The question only is concerning the bounds or limits of that glory, majesty, and of other gifts and graces, according to all which his human nature was really and internally changed and exalted. But shall we take upon us to set bounds to the glory, power, and majesty of the Son of God's human nature? God forbid. One thing it is to set bounds unto them, another to acknowledge that they are absolutely boundless and illimited.

The difference about the ubiquity of Christ's body rather verbal than real.

3. Here I must be enforced to touch a sore or breach in the church of God, which happy were it for reformed religion had it been made up or cemented with their blood which first did make it, or, being made, did seek to make it wider; I mean the bitter controversy between the Lutheran and other German and Helvetian churches. How easily this breach, concerning the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament, might have been made up when it first appeared, I refer myself to the testimony of Bucer, in whose judgment it was rather an appearance only of a breach, than 320
an apparent breach, if the Lutherans' meaning had been as accurately examined as their words, or manner of expressing it, were. But, without diligent examination, it was easy for others to mistake their meaning,

whenas Peter Martyr, a man otherwise as moderate as learned, did lay those opinions to the Lutherans' charge, which, as his dear friend Bucer (who tendered his seven years' service for making a friendly compromise in this controversy) seriously protests, he never could perceive that any Lutheran minister did maintain. Nor did he write otherwise to Peter Martyr than out of diligent examination of their own writings, and as in his own conscience he was persuaded: for he thus subscribes another letter of the same purport, sent to the Italian churches: *Ita sentio et in hac sententia opto venire ad tribunal Domini.* The ancient Lutherans, it seems, affected a language of their own, or a liberty to express their meditations concerning the dignity or exaltation of Christ's human nature after another manner, than the ancients had done, or many modern writers could well brook. And this liberty being denied them, especially by the churches of Switzerland, they sought in the issue to draw or tenter their matter to that frame of speech which they had not so warily conceived; and so at length the factious industry of some German court-divines did hatch a theological endless quarrel out of a verbal and grammatical controversy. It fell out so in the opposition of these German princes and their courts, as it doth between the factions of rank good-fellows and nice precisians in colleges or corporations; the one sort always provoking the other to be more profane, and then taking occasion by the increase of their profaneness to be more irregularly precise: both parties being by their daily bandyings far worse, than being sundered they would have been; whilst in the mean time true religion and sober devotion suffers on both hands betwixt them. Thus, upon the Lutherans' hyperbolical manner of expressing the exaltation of

Christ's manhood, the Helvetian churches took occasion to grant a less measure of dignity than was fitting; and the less they granted, the more the Lutherans still added to the advancement of his humanity, or the miraculous manner of his bodily presence in the sacrament; as if they had thought themselves bound in conscience to make a super-allowance for the others' arrears or detractions, as they at least conceived. And thus the missed truth ofttimes lies betwixt disagreeing parties, as it were offering itself to be surveyed by unpartial bystanders, or sorrowful spectators of causeless rueful broils betwixt brethren.

To add any excellency to Christ's divine nature by derogating from his humanity, we cannot; for being infinite, it cannot admit of any addition: and to derogate any thing from his humanity whereof it is or (for aught we know) may be capable from that special union which it hath with the divine nature, we dare not; for this were to derogate from or deny the power of God. But doth he derogate any thing from Christ's human nature that denies it to be infinitely exalted? It may be he doth, that doth deny the exaltation of his human nature (since his ascension, and sitting at the right hand of God the Father) to be in any sort infinite. The diverse acceptions of infinity, or diverse branches of it, to man's apprehension, are almost infinite; more by many than are fit to be displayed or mentioned in this place. It shall therefore suffice, first, to shew in what sense we must deny Christ's human nature to be infinitely exalted; and this must quash the lavish hyperboles of some modern Lutherans: secondly, in what sense Christ's human nature may be said to be, or at least may not be denied to be, infinitely exalted.

4. Christ's body may be conceived to be absolutely 321

infinite, or to be actually infinite only, but not absolutely; or to be potentially infinite only. To be absolutely infinite, or to be infinite simply in being, is proper to God, who is very being itself: and as he hath no cause of being, so he can have no limits or bounds of being, either for number of several sorts of being, or for degrees of several perfections. What kind of perfection soever we can conceive to be in any created substance, that we must acknowledge to be infinitely greater in him. Again, we may conceive an actual infinity of being only in one or two kinds; as, in respect of place, of strength or power. And though God be not infinite only in respect of these two branches of being, yet he only is actually infinite according to these two branches of infinity—the one we call his *immensity*, the other his *omnipotency*. No created substance can actually be every where at once; no creature can be omnipotent, or actually infinite in strength; for so it should be as strong as God, though not so wise or eternal as God. Now upon these two branches of divine infinity, that is, upon his immensity and omnipotency, the modern Lutherans make the human nature of Christ to incroach as a real participant, or equal sharer with the Divine Nature or blessed Trinity, if we may judge of their meaning by their words, or of their intended conclusions by their premisses expressly avouched and stiffly maintained. After their doctrine of Christ's real presence in the sacrament by consubstantiation began to be impugned and shaken, the later Lutherans sought to support it by a new buttress or pillar, which the ancienter did not rely upon in this argument, and that was, the ubiquity of Christ's body or human nature. Indeed if Christ's body were every where present, it should be consubstantially present in the sacrament;

but so it should be present in many other places, where none of the ancients did ever imagine it to be, where no good Christian is bound to seek it. Christ's body is not every where.

5. But to hunt out their meaning, at least the truth—concerning which, their meaning, I hope, is better than their expression; when they say, "Christ's glorified body is every where," they grant it to be in heaven. They should then in the first place tell us, whether in heaven it be not as visible and conspicuous to angels and saints, as it shall be to all men at his coming to judgment; secondly, whether this visibility of it doth not include a visible or comprehensible distinction of parts in it, as of his head from his feet, or his right hand from his left. This, I presume, they will not deny; for Christ shall only visibly change the place of his residence, not the substance, form, or fashion of his body, when he shall come from the right hand of God to judge the quick and the dead. This being granted, when they say, Christ's body is every where, they should in the third place tell us, whether it be every where according to this distinction of parts or no. *Si id Christi*, If that of Christ which they hold (as somewhat of Christ besides his divine nature they hold) to be every where have no distinction of parts, let them call it what they list, it is not in any language (besides their own and the modern Romish church's) *a body*, as having no properties of a body. If they will be content to deny all distinction of parts in that of Christ which they make to be the subject of this ubiquitary presence, we shall be content to take this their real denial for an approach to a compromise or agreement. If they will call that *a body* which we would call *a spiritual influence* or *a virtual presence*, (so we may know what they really mean by this word *body*,) let them enjoy their dialect. If they admit

a distinction of parts in that which they call Christ's
322 body, and which they make the subject of this ubiquitary presence, they should tell us, whether it be every where present according to every part; or whether it be every where present according to all its parts respectively: as whether the hands of Christ be every where, his heart every where, his head every where; or whether there be no place in the world wherein some part of Christ's body or human nature is not; yet so, that they will have his head to be in one part, his feet in another, his right hand in a third, and his left hand in a fourth place or dimension of this visible world. If they say, Christ's body is in this latter sort present every where, they make him a giant, not such a man as we conceive him to be; they do not exalt, but rather extend him, according to his human nature; the entire frame of whose body no man shall see, no not at the day of judgment, and yet, (by this tenent,) according to some parts of his human nature, he shall be consubstantially present with the damned in hell. If they say that Christ's whole body is entirely every where, or every part of it every where, then either he hath no right hand, or his right hand is in his left; either he hath no human body, or else his whole body is in his little finger. But to be after this manner entirely every where is proper only unto God.

A Lutheran syllogism.

6. It may be we shall hit their meaning better by tracing their footsteps. Thus then they proceed: 'The right hand of God is every where: Christ according to his human nature sitteth at the right hand of God: *ergo*, Christ according to his human nature sitteth every where:' and if his seat according to his human nature be every where, his human nature is present every where, for session or residence according

to his human nature includeth his presence according to his human nature. First, admitting the major, 'The right hand of God is every where,' were absolutely true, according to the literal meaning of this article, they stand bound by the rules of logic to rectify the minor, and make it thus: 'But Christ according to his human nature is the right hand of God.' And if Christ according to his human nature be the right hand of God, then if the right hand of God be every where, it would directly and perpendicularly follow, that Christ is every where according to his human nature. But this (i. e. the words of the minor) they will not say. Now the minor not being thus rectified, the conclusion must be corrected, and instead of saying, 'Christ's humanity is every where,' it must be taught to say, 'that Christ's humanity, or Christ according to his human nature, sitteth at that, or by that, which is every where.' Secondly, if we take that definition which some good divines make of Christ's sitting at the right hand of God the Father, that is, 'to be a person equal to the Father, by whom the Father doth immediately rule the world, but the church especially,' the inference will be a fallacy *a rebus ad voces.* The connexion between the terms, howsoever placed, will be no better than if a man should nail a piece of solid timber at the one end to the air, and at the other end to the water. Lastly, if by *the right hand of God* in this place be literally meant a visible or comprehensible throne, wherein the Godhead is after the like (but a far more glorious) manner conspicuously present, as it was in the ark of the covenant here on earth, then the major proposition, on which the whole structure of Christ's ubiquity according to his manhood depends, will be a great deal too narrow; for the right hand of God the Father

Almighty, taken in this sense, is not every where. That *glory of God*, at whose right hand St. Stephen saw Christ standing, was not on earth, but in heaven, nor in every place of heaven, but in that place only where he saw the heavens to open, and on which he fixed his eyes.

323 7. But they further add, "That Christ's human nature is glorified with that glory which he had with the Father before the world was made." Now that glory doubtless was no created glory, but glory uncreated; and if uncreated, then questionless infinite; and if this glory wherewith his human nature is glorified be infinite, then his human nature is infinitely exalted, or exalted to a real communication of all the divine attributes, as to be every where, to be omnipotent, &c. To this some answer: Christ's divine nature or person may in that place, John xvii. 5, be said to be glorified after the same manner that it was exalted. But though it be true that Christ meant the glorification of his divine person in that place, yet this no way contradicts the glorification of his human nature, but rather supposeth it. For his divine person was glorified by the glorification of his human nature; that is, the world should not have known the glory of the Son of God, or of him as their Lord and Redeemer, unless this glory had appeared in his manhood or human nature. Now if the human nature were glorified with that glory which was before the world, it was glorified with an uncreated glory; and uncreated glory is absolutely infinite: if this consequence were sound, the first branch of it would be this; 'That Christ's human nature was glorified with infinite glory before the foundation of the world;' and so the conclusion should contradict the article of Christ's incarnation in time, as also the whole course

A Lutheran objection, that proves *aut nihil aut nimium.*

of his humiliation here on earth. The same arguments which they bring to prove the glory of his human nature to be infinite in respect of place or power, will prove his human nature to have been infinite and glorious in respect of its duration, or Christ as man to be coeternal with God the Father, or else they prove just nothing at all. That real communication of the divine attributes which they so eagerly contend for is but a dream, or fancy, which could not possibly have come into their brains, but either for want of logic or of consideration. The root of their error is, that they distinguish not between the uncreated glory (which is the incomprehensible fountain, by participation whereof Christ's human nature is immediately glorified) and the participation or communication of it. The glory of the Godhead, which dwelleth bodily in Christ, is infinite. But it is not communicated to Christ's human nature according to its infinity; the communication of it, or the glory communicated, is created, and therefore finite. The sun truly and really communicates his light unto the moon; and we properly say, that the moon is enlightened or made glorious by the light of the sun; yet will it not hence follow, that the light communicated or imparted to the moon is equal to the light of the sun, which doth communicate it, or impart it: much less will it follow, that the glory wherewith Christ's human nature is glorified should be equal to that glory of the Godhead which doth communicate or impart glory unto it, or from which all the glory which it hath above other creatures is derived. To conclude this point: the best frame whereunto the Lutherans' arguments in this controversy can be drawn is this; 'The glory of God is infinite: Christ as man is glorified by the glory of God: *ergo*, His glory as

man is infinite:' yet the connexion is not as good as this following: 'The light of the sun doth by his presence make the day: but the moon is enlightened by the light of the sun: *ergo*, the moon by presence of its light makes the day.' Sooner shall the Lutheran turn night into day, by this or the like sophism, than prove that real communication of the divine attributes to Christ's human nature which he dreams of; as, That Christ as man should be really present every
324 where, or omnipotent, because the glory of God wherewith he is glorified is every where; or, because the power or right hand by which he is strengthened is a power omnipotent, omnipotency itself. Thus much of that absolute infinity, or infinity in act, unto which Christ's human nature was not exalted; and yet it was exalted in some sort infinitely above all other created substances; and so exalted, or at least declared to be so exalted, specially by the ascension of it into heaven, and by its sitting at the right hand of God the Father.

8. That is *infinitum actu*, or actually infinite, *extra quod nihil est;* which is so perfect and complete, that nothing in the same kind can be added unto it: that is *infinitum potentia*, or potentially infinite, unto which somewhat may successively be added without end or ceasing. Thus philosophers have taught that, *in continua quantitate non datur minimum; in discreta, non datur maximum:* there is not the least quantity but is divisible into infinite parts; there is no member so great but may still be made greater by addition; and albeit addition were made every moment unto the world's end, yet the product could not be actually infinite; some number might be added unto it which as yet is not contained in it. In this manner the participated power or glory of God, or the partici-

pation of this power or glory may be infinite. The participation of this power or being may every moment whilst the world lasteth, or whilst immortal creatures continue in being, be greater than other, and yet never come to be so great, but that it may be augmented or bettered; and that which may be augmented or bettered, cannot be actually infinite. The least parcel of earth could not subsist without the participation of God's power or being; and the least or dullest part of the earth, which participates of his being, doth in a sort infinitely exceed nothing, or that which is not. Nothing could have any being, but by participating of his being who is infinite. No power besides infinite power could out of nothing produce something. Trees and plants, and other works of the fourth and fifth days' creation, excel the earth—beasts of the field excel them—man excelleth the beasts of the field—and the angels excel man in nobility and dignity of being; and yet the most excellent amongst the angels is but a participation of God's power or excellency; and, as divines collect, God hath not made any creature so excellent, but he may make it more excellent every day than other; yet (this supposed) should not the excellency of it be actually infinite, because it may be still bettered; yet may that, which is not actually infinite in any one kind, or according to any one branch of infinity, actually contain greater excellency or perfection in it, than the addition of perfection unto some other creature, though by succession infinite, can attain unto. And thus Christ's human nature, by reason of the personal union which it hath with the Godhead, or with the Son of God, contains greater excellency in it of divers kinds, than any other created substance not so united, though the faculties or perfections of it were continually bettered, could reach unto.

9. But, omitting the dignity of Christ's human nature in the general, it will be a more profitable search to examine the particular effects or efficacy which his human nature, now exalted, hath in respect of us. These may not be measured, much less limited, by other men's most noble faculties or perfections. The most dull sight on earth may see as far as the sun or stars; and the most quick sight cannot see beyond them. No man's eyesight can pierce through the thickest clouds, much less through the heavens above, or through the rocks here on earth. Though thus to do were absolutely impossible to man, or any other creature endued with sight, we might not hence thus collect, 'Christ's glorified eyes are human eyes, as ours are, created eyes, as ours are, therefore he cannot with these bodily eyes look down from heaven, and behold what is done, or lies hid in the most secret corners of the earth;' or that his faculty of hearing, because a created faculty, cannot apprehend all the blasphemies or oaths, even the most secret murmurings of his enemies, either against him or his church. Or, admitting any saints' eyes, already glorified in body in heaven, could by vision of the divine nature see all things that are done in earth, or that his ears could hear all the conference that passeth in this kingdom for some one day; yet this excellency of his outward senses being supposed, his internal or intellective faculties were not able to distinguish betwixt every thing so heard or seen, or to censure every word or deed as it deserves: nor could his memory perhaps perfectly retain what for the present he apprehends or conceives. Yet may we not hence argue; 'Christ's intellective faculties are but human (not divine); *ergo*, he cannot distinctly and infallibly judge or censure every thing he sees or hears, or infallibly retain the records of his judgment or censure inviolate

and entire unto the day of judgment.' Bound we are rather to believe, that Christ as man, or with his human eyes, sees all our wrongs, and as man hears all our prayers, and takes notice of all our doings; or, that he, who as man shall be our judge, is in the mean time an eyewitness of all our misdeeds or well doings, an earwitness of all our speeches, good or bad. Nor may we again, by broken inductions, gathered from the effects or efficacy of natural bodies, or created substances upon other bodies, take upon us to limit or bound the efficacy of Christ's body upon the bodies or souls which he hath taken to his protection. We may not collect, that Christ's body, because comprehended within the heavens, can exercise no real operation upon our bodies or souls here on earth; or that the live influence of his glorified human nature may not be diffused through the world as he shall be pleased to dispense it, or to sow the seeds of life issuing from it, sometimes here, sometimes there.

10. This real, though virtual influence of Christ's human nature, is haply that which the Lutherans call the *real ubiquitary presence of Christ's body* [k]. Luther himself never denied Christ's very body or human nature to be comprehended within the heavens; and yet he affirmed it to be "present with us in such a manner, as the sound is present with us which is really made or caused a great way from us." And we may not deny this real influence or virtual presence of Christ to be in a manner infinite; or at least to extend itself to all created substances that are capable of it, in what created distance soever they be from his body, whose residence we believe to be in the highest heavens, at the right hand of God. This kind of infinity of his presence can seem no paradox or improbable imagina-

[k] See book 10. ch. 55, 56. [vol. ix. pp. 586, 604.]

tion to any good Christian, that will but raise his thoughts above the earth by this or the like experiment of nature: Albeit this bodily sun which we daily see were much further distant from the earth than now it is, yet could we easily conceive it to be of force and efficacy enough to enlighten the earth whereon we dwell, and those celestial spheres which are or might be as far above it as it is above the centre: and in the greatest distance we can imagine it is or might be distant from the earth, it would give life and vigour to things vegetable, or capable of vital heat. It were a silly argument to infer, that because the hottest fire on earth cannot impart his heat to bodies ten miles distant from it, therefore the sun cannot communicate vital
326 heat and comfort to vegetables more than ten hundred thousand miles distant from it. This inference, notwithstanding, is not so foolish in philosophy, as this following is in divinity: 'The sun cannot quicken trees or herbs which have lost their root and sap; *ergo*, the Sun of righteousness, or Christ's human nature, in which the Godhead dwelleth bodily, cannot quicken the dead, or raise up our mortal bodies to immortality.' The only sure anchor of all our hopes for a joyful resurrection unto the life of glory, is the mystical union which must be wrought here on earth betwixt Christ's human nature glorified and our mortal or dissoluble nature. The divine nature indeed is the prime fountain of life to all, but, though inexhaustible in itself, yet a fountain whereof we cannot drink, save as it is derived unto us through the human nature of Christ.

11. Although it be most true which Tertullian (in the seventeenth chapter of his Apology) hath observed, "That even those heathens which adored Jupiter Capitolinus, and multiplied their gods according to the number of the places wherein they worshipped them, when

they were throughly stung with any grievous affliction or calamity, were wont to lift up their eyes and hands, not to the Roman capitol, but to heaven itself; as knowing that, by instinct of nature, to be the seat or throne of divine Majesty, and the hill from whence came their help;" yet (notwithstanding the truth of this observation, and the profitable use which that father there makes of it) it was an extraordinary favour of God unto the Israelites, that they were permitted and instructed to worship God in his sanctuary, and to present their devotions towards the ark of the covenant, or the mercy-seat, before which they might adore him in such manner and sort, as they might not in any other place, or before any other creature. They knew much better than the heathen, that God's throne of Majesty was in heaven, and yet were to tender their devotions unto him as extraordinarily present in his temple or sanctuary here on earth. For as our bodily sight doth scatter or dazzle, without some sensible object to gather and terminate it; so our cogitations, though of heaven and heavenly things, do float or vanish, without some determinate and comprehensible object whereon to fasten them. Now, albeit the temple of Jerusalem, wherein God's people only were to worship, were long since demolished; yet the sanctuary, wherein they were to worship God, is rather translated or advanced from earth to heaven, than destroyed: for it was God's presence that made the temple; and that is more extraordinary in Christ's body, (which the Jews destroyed, but which he raised again in three days,) than ever it had been in Solomon's temple; in the glory of whose goodly structure, and manifestation of God's glory in it, the true Israelites did much rejoice, and the later Jews too much boast and glory. But this prerogative we have in respect of the ancientest and truest Israel-

ites, that, since the veil of the temple was rent, we may at all times (reflecting upon that model the scripture hath imprinted in our minds) look within the veil, and behold the ark or mercy-seat, and use the most holy sanctuary, or inner place made with hands, as a perspective glass or instrument for surveying the heavenly sanctuary, *which God hath pitched, and not man. This hope we have* (saith St. Paul, Heb. vi. 19, 20.) *as an anchor of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec.* He is gone before us into the sanctuary to make perpetual intercession, who before had made an everlasting atonement for us here on earth. He is now become to us the temple of God, the ark of the covenant, the
327 propitiatory, or mercy-seat, the fulfilling of all things: and unto him, now placed in his sanctuary at the right hand of God, we are not only to direct our cogitations or devotions, but to transmit our affections to the divine nature by him. The Son of God, after he had suffered in our flesh, (and made a full sufficient satisfaction for all our sins,) did in our nature rise again, did in our nature ascend into heaven, and in our nature sitteth at the right hand of God, not only to gather our scattered contemplations and broken notions of the Godhead, but withal to draw and unite our affections unto him, which otherwise would flag, droop, or miscarry, if we should direct them to heaven at large, or to the incomprehensible Majesty of the Godhead, without a known advocate or intercessor to present them, and to return their effects or issues. Hence saith our apostle, Coloss. iii. 1, 2: *If ye then be risen with Christ*, that is, if you steadfastly believe that Christ, who was the Son of God, (and as incompre-

hensible for his divine nature as God the Father, to whom he was equal) did die in your flesh and comprehensible nature, and in the same nature did rise again from the dead, *seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God: set* (or *settle*, or *fasten*) *your affection on things above, not on things on the earth.* And as we are to settle our dearest affections on him, so are we to direct our prayers unto him in his heavenly sanctuary.

12. That we may direct our prayers unto the blessed Trinity according to the rule of faith, (which is the first degree of praying in faith,) take, for the present, these short directions: The first and fundamental object of belief, as Christian, is the acknowledgment of the blessed Trinity. And by this belief we acknowledge such a distinction of persons, or parties, between God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, that God the Father doth personally, and in propriety of person, exact satisfaction for all the offences committed against the Godhead, or blessed Trinity; and that the Son of God doth by like personal propriety undertake to make satisfaction and reconciliation for us: he it is that doth avert the wrath of God from us and inhibit the proceedings of divine justice against us. We are then, in the first place, either expressly or implicitly to direct our prayers to God the Father, that he would be pleased to forgive us our sins, to be reconciled unto us, and bestow such blessings upon us as he hath promised to such as shall be reconciled unto him. In the second place, either expressly or implicitly, we are to beseech him to forgive us our sins, to be reconciled and bless us for the merits of his only Son, who hath made satisfaction for us. This is a point which every Christian is bound expressly to believe—that God the Father doth neither forgive sins,

nor vouchsafe any term or plea of reconciliation, but only for the merits and satisfaction made by the sacrifice of the Son of God, who by the eternal Spirit offered himself in our human nature upon the cross. In the next place, we are to believe and acknowledge, that as God the Father doth neither forgive nor vouchsafe reconciliation, but for the merits and satisfaction of his only Son; so neither will he vouchsafe to convey this or any other blessing unto us, which his Son hath purchased for us, but only through his Son; not only through him as our Advocate or Intercessor, but through him as our Mediator; that is, through his humanity, as the organ or conduit, or as the only bond, by which we are united and reconciled unto the divine nature. For although the Holy Spirit, or third person in Trinity, doth immediately and by personal propriety work faith and other spiritual graces in our souls, yet doth he not by these spiritual graces unite our souls or spirits immediately unto himself, but unto Christ's human nature. He doth as it were till the ground of
328 our hearts, and make it fit to receive the seed of life; but this seed of righteousness immediately flows from the Sun of righteousness, whose sweet influence likewise it is, which doth immediately season, cherish, and ripen it. The spirit of life, whereby our adoption and election is sealed unto us, is the real participation of Christ's body, which was broken, and of Christ's blood, which was shed for us. This is the true and punctual meaning of our apostle's speech, 1 Cor. xv. 45: *The first man Adam was made a living soul*, or, as the Syriac hath it, *animale corpus*—"an enlivened body;" but *the last Adam was made a quickening spirit;* and immediately becometh such to all those which as truly bear his image by the spirit of regeneration, which issues from him, as they have borne the image

of the first Adam by natural propagation. And this again is the true and punctual meaning of our Saviour's words, John vi. 63: *It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.* For so he had said in the verses before, to such as were offended at his words, *What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before?* The implication contained in the connexion between these two verses and the precedent is this—That Christ's virtual presence, or the influence of life, which his human nature was to distil from his heavenly throne, should be more profitable to such as were capable of it, than his bodily presence, than the bodily eating of his flesh and blood could be, although it had been convertible into their bodily substance. This distillation of life and immortality from his glorified human nature, is that which the ancient and orthodoxal church did mean in their figurative and lofty speeches of Christ's real presence, or of eating his very flesh, and drinking his very blood in the sacrament. And the sacramental bread is called *his body*, and the sacramental wine *his blood*, as for other reasons, so especially for this, that the virtue or influence of his bloody sacrifice is most plentifully and most effectually distilled from heaven unto the worthy receivers of the eucharist: and unto this point and no further will most of the testimonies reach, which Bellarmine in his books of the Sacraments, or Maldonate in his Comments upon the sixth of St. John, do quote out of the fathers for Christ's real presence by transubstantiation; or which Chemnitius, that learned Lutheran, in his books, *De duabus in Christo Naturis*, and *De Fundamentis sanæ Doctrinæ*, doth avouch for consubstantiation. And if thus much had been as distinctly granted to the ancient Lutherans, as Calvin in

some places doth, the controversy between the Lutheran and other reformed churches had been at an end when it first begun; both parties acknowledging St. Cyril to be the fittest umpire in this controversy[1].

A transition of the publisher's.

IT must not be dissembled, that I had no intimation, much less commission, of the author's, to insert the two following chapters here in this place. Yet, besides that I knew not of any fitter place where to dispose of them, I had these reasons so to do:

1. I held it fit, that his powerful disputes against the church of Rome, about the Lord's supper, in the fourth chapter, and about another point in the fifth, should immediately follow his learned argument with the Lutheran.

2. The sequence seems very methodical, the subject of the
329 fifth chapter being partly about Christ's exaltation, by becoming the chief corner stone, (cut out of the rock or quarry by his resurrection from the new sepulchre, lifted up by his ascension, and placed at the chief corner by his sitting at God's right hand,) and partly about the union of Christ with true Christians; which union is both a considerable part of the fourth chapter, and was happily touched upon in the close of the third.

3. In case any restive soul should—perhaps some faint dejected spirit, having read Christ's great exaltation, may—say, *Who shall ascend into heaven? that is, to bring Christ down from above;* such an one, besides the quickenings he may hear from other remembrancers, (St. Peter telling us that we are *pilgrims* here; and St. Paul, that we *seek a country*, and *look for a city, Jerusalem that is free;* and that being *fellow-citizens with the saints, and of God's household, our conversation*, or *traffick, is to be in heaven, for those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at God's right hand*, &c.) may receive mighty encouragement by experimenting the contents of

[1] Besides what may be found in Cyril of Alex., see Cyril Hierosol. in Cateches. Mystag, 1, 3, 4.

these two next chapters—the avowed near approach and intimacy of our Lord Jesus Christ with the believing and receiving Christian: *The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart:* when the holy sacramental pledges be in the mouth, and faith in the heart, *the Word*, the eternal Word that was made flesh, is nigh indeed: for, *Verily, verily..... he that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.*

CHAP. IV.

A Paraphrase upon the sixth of St. John. In what Sense Christ's Flesh is said to be truly Meat, &c. What it is, to eat Christ's Flesh and drink his Blood. Of eating and drinking spiritual and sacramental; and whether of them is meant, John vi. 56. *Of Communion in one Kind, and receiving Christ's Blood* per Concomitantiam. *Tollet's Exposition of Christ's Words,* Except ye eat...and drink... *by Disjunction, turning* and *into* or, *confuted. And Rules given for better expounding like Places. How Christ dwells in us, and we in him. The Application. All which be seasonable Meditations upon the Lord's Supper.*

JOHN VI. 56.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him: or *abideth in me, and I in him.*

1. SEEING these words contain the grand mystery of godliness, not only of God manifested in the flesh, but of God still with us, yea dwelling in us, and seeing they are withal the conclusion or centre of our Saviour's long dispute with the murmuring Jews, it will be necessary to unfold the chief contents of this chapter. At the tenth verse you may read how our Saviour had satisfied five thousand hungry souls with five barley loaves and two fishes, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments: upon the experience of this strange wonder, this great multitude sought *to make him their king.* A good project, I must confess, if we value it

only by the usual measure or aim of popular elections. What people would not be willing to have such an one for their king, as were able to feed a whole army without contribution, tax, or toll from them; without any further toil and care, either on their part or his, than giving of thanks, and distribution of extemporary provision by his ministers? "But besides this politic
330 motive, they had a prenotion, that their expected Messias or King should enter upon his kingdom at the feast of the passover, a little before which time this miracle was wrought: and it was a received opinion, (as Tacitus telleth us[m],) that there should a great king about this time arise in Judah." Nor did this people err much in the circumstance of time wherein their Messias should be enthroned in the kingdom of David; for so he was, at, or soon after, the passover following[n]. But they utterly mistook the nature of his kingdom, and the manner of his reign. Yet in that they sought to make this man (for so, and no more than so, they conceived him to be) their king, it is more than probable that they took him for their expected Messias. And indeed upon sight of the miracle which he had wrought, they expressly confess so much, ver. 14: *This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.* But, seeing neither his kingdom was of this world, nor was he to be instated in it by the voices and suffrages of men; he, who knew all times and seasons, knew this was not the time of his coronation, and therefore *when he perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.* ver. 15. And his disciples, being for the present discharged of their attendance, crossed the sea without him to Capernaum, which was the place of his

[m] Hist. lib. 5. So Suetonius in Vespas. [n] Viz. at his resurrection and ascension. See book 9. ch. 39. [vol. viii. p. 465.]

and their abode, vv. 16, 17. The people which had been more than eyewitnesses of the former miracle, having observed that he could not come to Capernaum, where the next day they found him, by ship or boat, demand of him, ver. 25, *Rabbi, when camest thou hither?* The strange manner of his coming thither before them, did (it seems) no less affect them, than the former miracle, though neither did affect them as was fitting: for so our Saviour plainly tells them, ver. 26: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.* These were the same men which saw the miracle; but, in seeing it they did not see it; that is, they did not in heart consider, that he had fed their bodies with corporal bread, to no other end, save only to stir up the appetite of their souls after celestial food. So our Saviour testifies unto them, ver. 27: *Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth to everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed:* that is, he was to be a king of God's appointing, not of theirs.

2. Now, albeit the former miracle of five loaves and two fishes had extorted that confession from them before mentioned, *This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world;* yet this reproof of our Saviour's provokes them to question the validity of their former verdict; for they demand a further sign of him before they will acknowledge that he was indeed the great Prophet, or one whom they might believe was sent from God; for so they say, vv. 30, 31: *What sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work? Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.* The question at last comes to this

issue, Whether the manna which their fathers did eat in the wilderness were the true bread of life, or bread from heaven, better than which they were not to expect[o]? Our Saviour maintains the negative, vv. 32, 33: *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven: for the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.* All this they can well brook, *in thesi*, or general, for so they reply, ver. 34, *Lord, evermore give us this bread.* But when our Saviour comes from the thesis to the hypothesis, or from the general doctrine, which they so well approved, to make this
331 particular application, *I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst*, ver. 35—they leave their questioning, and fall to murmuring, taking a sudden occasion or strange hint of offence at his person or parentage [p]. Whereas before they were forward to make him their king, they now reply, *Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?* ver. 42.

3. Thus their fathers had murmured against Moses and Aaron in the wilderness; one while for want of bread, Exod. xvi. 2, accounting their estate in Egypt much better than their present condition in the wilderness; another while they murmur for water, Exod. xv. 24; and again, Exod. xvii. 3, *Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst?* Thus they murmured against Moses, whom they had seen to work so mighty wonders. And thus their foolish posterity

[o] See St. Cyril Alex. in his Glaphyr. on Exodus.

[p] Of the inconstancy of vulgar affections, see book 10. ch. 23. [vol. ix. p. 143.]

murmured against him whom (for the former miracle they had acknowledged *the great prophet* whom God had promised to *raise up unto them, like unto Moses in all things;* and therefore like unto him in this, in that he endured their murmurings against him with greater patience and meekness than Moses did; albeit they had no such occasion of murmuring as their forefathers had: for their fathers murmured in their hunger or thirst; whereas this great Prophet had prevented this occasion of murmuring, by feeding them plenteously before they had sought to him for food. That which Moses saith unto the murmuring Israelites, Exod. xvi. 8, was now exactly fulfilled: *The Lord* (saith he) *heareth your murmurings which ye murmur against him: and what are we? your murmurings are not against us, but against the Lord.* These Jews murmur against the Son (as they suppose) of Joseph and Mary; less weening that in murmuring against him they did personally murmur against the Son of God, than their fathers did when they murmured against Moses, that they had murmured against their God. But the same Lord which heard their murmurings then by the mediate presence or infinite knowledge of his Godhead, hears them now with the ears of man, as immediately and as sensibly as Moses heard their fathers murmur. Now, as God in the wilderness, though he heard their fathers' murmurings, did yet grant them their desire—*At even ye shall eat flesh, and in the morning ye shall be filled with bread; and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God.* Exod. xvi. 12—so the same Lord now, albeit this foolish people murmur against him to his face, (not for denying, but for proffering them the true food of life,) is so far from chiding them as Moses did, that he presseth them to make trial of his bounty, and to accept his proffer,

with greater vehemency of words, yet with more meekness of language, than Moses did at any time use. *Murmur not* (saith he) *among yourselves*, ver. 43, &c. *I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.* vv. 48—51. And here again they increase their murmuring, for they *strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* ver. 52. Thus, as their fathers *tempted God in their heart* by *asking meat for their lust*, psalm lxxviii. 18, so have their posterity. They sought him out, that they might have their bellies filled with corporal bread, and yet when he had given them this in great abundance, by means miraculous, they will not believe that he is able to give them what he promiseth, *bread from heaven*, or
332 *his flesh, to eat*, (which is the bread or staff of life.) So incredulous their fathers had been, that after the sight of many miracles in Egypt, they would not trust him in the wilderness; after the experience of one miracle in the wilderness, they would not trust him for a second. *They spake against God; they said, Can God furnish a table in the wilderness? Behold, he smote the rock, that the waters gushed out, and the streams overflowed; can he give bread also? can he provide flesh for his people? Therefore the Lord heard this, and was wroth: so a fire was kindled against Jacob, and anger also came up against Israel; because they believed not in God, and trusted not in his salvation.* But now this *salvation* of God, even God himself made their *Jesus*, or *salvation*, (for all is

one,) is come nearer unto this later people; and yet they will not believe him, they will not trust in him. Yet his anger is not presently kindled against them for not believing: the more they doubt, the more they question, the more they murmur or strive; the more he presseth the necessity of eating his flesh upon them; first negatively, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you;* then affirmatively. *Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day,* vv. 53, 54. And lastly, he gives the reason, as well of the negative as of the affirmative, *For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed,* ver. 55. So that in him these Jews were to expect the fulness of the body of all those contentments, for whose shadows their fathers so greedily longed in the wilderness, and for want of which they so murmured against Moses, as these men now do against the Lord which appeared to Moses, for giving them assurance of them.

4. In what sense Christ's flesh is said to be truly meat, and his blood to be truly drink, I have shewed elsewhere. The sum was this: *His flesh is meat indeed, his blood is drink indeed, non formaliter, sed eminenter;* meat indeed, and drink indeed, not in respect of the natural qualities of corporal meat and drink, for these must be swallowed, concocted, digested, and finally converted into our bodily substance. That Christ's flesh, according to these qualities, is truly meat, or his blood truly drink, the Romish church doth not avouch. For if his body should be concocted or digested, or converted into our bodily substance, it should suffer corruption. And to be swallowed only and not concocted, is no property of meat or drink. Christ's flesh then is said truly meat, and his blood

drink indeed, in respect of the end whereto all manner of food is destinated. The best end of all bodily food is to preserve or continue bodily life; and that is the best food or diet which most effectually procureth this end. Howbeit bodily life cannot be first given or implanted by the best bodily meat that is, but only continuated or preserved; but Christ's flesh was given, not only to continue life, but *to give life unto the world*[q]: it is the root of life, as well as the food of life, if we speak of life spiritual or everlasting, which only is life indeed. And inasmuch as his flesh and blood are the roots and fountains of this kind of life, the one is most truly said to be *meat indeed*, the other most truly *drink indeed:* that is, meat and drink more effectual and more necessary for the attainment of everlasting life, than bodily food is for life temporal. Again, temporal or bodily life cannot be continued or preserved otherwise than by the corruption or destruction of the bodily meat which preserves it. But Christ's flesh and blood preserve life spiritual, or our "souls and bodies unto everlasting life[r]," because they are incorruptible and cannot be changed, be not so much as subject to alteration. Now if all other meat besides this must suffer corruption, and lose its nature, before
333 it can become a cause or means of preserving bodily life, such meat cannot be truly said to remain in us, much less can we be said to remain or abide in it. But of Christ's flesh and blood he himself here saith it, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him:* and for this reason *his flesh is meat indeed*, and *his blood is drink indeed*— the only meat and the only drink which men should hunger and thirst after. Other meats and drinks should

[q] John vi. 32, 33. 41. 48. 50, &c.; 1 Cor. xv. 45.

[r] So the Church Liturgy in the words of ministration.

be sought for, yea life bodily itself should be desired, only to this end, that by the prolonging of it we might be partakers in greater measure of this meat and drink, which preserves the body and soul unto everlasting life.

5. The questions then to be discussed are two:

First, What it is to eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood?

Secondly, What it is for Christ to dwell or abide in us, and us to dwell or abide in him?

All agree that there is a twofold eating of Christ's body and a twofold drinking of his blood; one merely sacramental, and another spiritual: which agreement notwithstanding, there ariseth a third question, viz. What manner of eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood is in this place either only or principally meant? Three questions.

For the resolution of this question, we are briefly to explicate each member of this division; viz. 1. What it is to eat Christ's body and drink his blood sacramentally only; 2. What it is to eat his body and drink his blood spiritually.

First then, all that are partakers of this sacrament eat Christ's body and drink his blood sacramentally; that is, they eat that bread which sacramentally is his body, and drink that cup which sacramentally is his blood, whether they eat or drink faithfully or unfaithfully. For *all the Israelites*, 1 Cor. x, *drank of the same spiritual Rock, which was Christ* sacramentally; all of them were partakers of his presence, when Moses smote the rock: yet *with many of them God was not well pleased*, because they did not faithfully either drink or participate of his presence. And more displeased he is with such as eat Christ's body and drink his blood unworthily, though they eat and drink them sacramentally: for eating and drinking so only, that is,

without faith, or due respect, they eat and drink to their own condemnation, because they do not discern or rightly esteem Christ's body or presence in the holy sacrament.

May we say then, that Christ is really present in the sacrament, as well to the unworthy as to the faithful receivers? Yes, this we must grant; yet must we add withal, that he is really present with them in a quite contrary manner; really present he is, because virtually present to both, because the operation or efficacy of his body and blood is not metaphorical but real in both[s]. Thus the bodily sun, though locally distant for its substance, is really present by its heat and light, as well to sore eyes as to clear sights, but really present to both by a contrary real operation; and by the like contrary operation it is really present to clay and to wax—it really hardeneth the one, and really softeneth the other. So doth Christ's body and blood, by its invisible but real influence, mollify the hearts of such as come to the sacrament with due preparation; but harden such as unworthily receive the consecrated elements. If he that will hear the word must *take heed how he hears*, much more must he which means to receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood be careful how he receives. He that will present himself at this great marriage feast of the Lamb without a wedding garment, had better be absent. It was always safer not to approach the presence of God, manifested
334 or exhibited in extraordinary manner, (as in his sanctuary or in the ark,) than to make appearance before it in an unhallowed manner, or without due preparation. Now when we say that Christ is really present in the sacrament, our meaning is, that as God he is present in an extraordinary manner, after such a manner as he

[s] See vol. ix. pp. 598. 612.

was present (before his incarnation) in his sanctuary, the ark of his covenant; and by the power of his Godhead, thus extraordinarily present, he diffuseth the virtue or operation of his human nature, either to the vivification or hardening of their hearts who receive the sacramental pledges. So then a man by eating Christ's body merely sacramentally may be hardened, may be excluded from his gracious presence. But no man hath Christ dwelling in him by this manner of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, unless withal he eat the one and drink the other spiritually. The eating then of Christ's body and drinking his blood merely sacramentally is not the eating and drinking here meant.

Eating and drinking merely sacramental, not meant in St. John vi. 56.

6. They are said to eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood spiritually, which rightly apprehend his death and passion, which by faith meditate and ruminate upon them, making application to themselves, as well of the great danger which may ensue upon the neglect of such great benefits as he hath purchased for them, as of the inestimable good which always accompanies the right esteem or contemplation of his body which was given for them, and of his blood which was shed for them. He which thus eateth Christ's flesh and drinketh his blood by faith, although he do not (for the time present) eat his body or drink his blood sacramentally, hath a true interest in this promise—*He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him*—so he do not neglect to eat his body and drink his blood sacramentally, when occasion requires and opportunity serves. So that spiritual eating and drinking Christ by faith is the true preparative for the worthy receiving of his body and blood sacramentally. He that doth not so prepare himself for the receiving of his body and blood, doth receive

him unworthily, whilst he receives him sacramentally.

The third, or main question.

The main question is, Whether Christ's words be to be understood at all of sacramental eating and drinking, or of spiritual eating and drinking only?

7. Many there were, and yet are, in reformed churches, which deny this place to be meant of sacramental eating. But, as Beza (amongst others) well observes, they which deny this place to be meant at all of sacramental eating, err no less than they do, which restrain it only to sacramental eating. Their error (which deny it to be meant at all of sacramental eating) is so much the worse, because it gave advantage to our adversaries of the Romish church, which want no wit to work upon all advantages given. To omit others, Jansenius and Dr. Hessels (two of the most exquisite expositors of scriptures, and most judicious divines which the Romish church had after the reformation was begun by Luther and Zuinglius, and prosecuted by Calvin) expressly deny our Saviour's dispute in this chapter with the Jews to be meant at all of sacramental eating and drinking. The reason which enforced these two great divines to slight the authority of most writers in their own church, and to wave the authority of most ancient fathers, (which it is evident do understand this place of sacramental eating and drinking,) was, because they saw no possibility how to maintain the peremptory decrees of the councils of Constance and Basil, concerning communion under one kind, if the words of our Saviour, ver. 53. of this chapter, be to be understood of sacramental eating and drinking. For it is granted by all, that the consecrated bread is sacramentally his body, not his blood; and that the cup is sacramentally his blood, not his body: and yet our Saviour's words are express, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have*

Beza's observation.

Jansenius and Dr. Hessels's opinion.

no life in you. So that all which hope to have life must sacramentally drink his blood as well as eat his flesh, if this place be meant of sacramental eating. That evasion, which most of our modern priests and Jesuits use for eluding rather than answering this objection, was too palpable in the judgment of these two great divines, as it since hath seemed to others of that church, which yet maintain that the former words of our Saviour are to be understood of sacramental eating Christ's flesh and drinking Christ's blood. The evasion of modern priests and Jesuits is, that he which sacramentally receives Christ's body under the shape or form of sacramental bread doth with it receive his blood *per concomitantiam*, " by way of concomitancy," because there is blood contained in his body which they thus receive. But this cannot satisfy any Romish divine which understands himself, or the ancient doctrine which that church pretends to follow. For this device of receiving Christ's blood in the bread *per concomitantiam* was but a late invention, little above two hundred years before Jansenius or Hessels lived. And the newness of this imagination or invention (which was generally applauded in the Romish church in his time) was one special motive why that reverend pastor of blessed memory, Mr. Gilpin, did disclaim the Romish church's doctrine in the point of transubstantiation, as bishop Tunstal, his uncle, before him had done.

Secondly, admitting the bread were turned into Christ's very body, and after this conversion had blood in it as truly as flesh and bones, yet all this would not salve the literal sense of our Saviour's words in ver. 53, if the eating and drinking which he there speaks of were sacramental. For suppose a man should feed upon raw flesh, or upon flesh which had visible or

material blood in it, we might say indeed that he did eat blood *per concomitantiam*, "by way of concomitancy," because the flesh which he eats had blood in it; but no man would say that he did drink blood *per concomitantiam*. For eating and drinking are two distinct acts, and incompatible at one and the same time. He that eateth flesh with blood in it, doth not eat the flesh and drink the blood whilst he only eats, but eats both together, the one as principally, the other as an appurtenance, if he eat as a man, and not as swine do draugh, which is no more an eating than a drinking. Or if a man should drink blood mingled with some small portions of flesh, we might say, he did drink flesh by way of concomitancy; but no man would say that he did eat blood *per concomitantiam*, albeit there were flesh in the blood which he drinks, for he drinks both together, he doth not eat either [t]. And for these reasons pope Innocent expressly denies that he which eats Christ's body, whilst he only eats it, doth drink his blood [u].

8. The only refuge which the most learned in the Romish church, since Jansenius and Hessels died, have found out for answering the former objection of reformed writers, is, that the words of our Saviour, *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you*, are to be expounded disjunctively; as thus: *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man*, or *drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* The use or corollary of this exposition is, that if Christian people do sacramentally *either* eat Christ's flesh *or* drink his blood as they ought, that is, with
336 due preparation, this will suffice; seeing, as they pretend,

[t] Vid. Tollet in Joh. vi. annot. 26.

[u] In his fourth book, Myster. Evangel. Legis ac Sacramenti Eucharist. cap. 20. edit. Venet. in quarto.

there is no divine precept which enjoins all Christian people sacramentally to receive Christ's body and blood under both kinds [x]: nor all priests, but only such as do officiate or consecrate. The precept of institution—*Bibite ex hoc omnes—Drink ye all of this*, was punctually directed (as they allege) to our Saviour's apostles only, who were at this time made priests, and authorized to minister Christ's body and blood after his death. Yet were they not (by their leave) at this time *sacerdotes conficientes*. Our Saviour Christ himself did consecrate both the bread and wine; the apostles were as much inferior to him, as the meanest lay people are to the greatest priest in the Romish church, to the pope, or *summus pontifex*, himself. But the further discussion of this point belongs more properly to the words of the institution. The other point of expounding it by *vel*, or of shuffling in *or* for *and*, belongs to the cognizance of vv. 53 and 56. To justify this exposition, cardinal Tollet would persuade us, that St. John's Greek text is full of Hebrewisms, and there is nothing more familiar with Moses, or with other sacred Hebrew writers, than to use *and* for *or*, *et* for *vel*. And he brings divers instances to this purpose: as for example, that in Exod. xxi. 17, *He that curseth father* and *mother shall surely be put to death*. So it is word for word in the Hebrew, and yet our English translation, as well as the Vulgar Latin, renders the original thus: *He that curseth father* or *mother shall surely be put to death*. And it would be an ungodly evasion for any magistrate not to censure him as a transgressor of this law which curseth his father, albeit he do not curse his mother; or which curseth his mother, albeit he do not curse, but rather bless his

[x] By this exposition, one might as well communicate by receiving only the cup as the bread only.

father. But must the true interpretation of such as are to judge according to this law be derived from the peculiar phrase or dialect of the Hebrews? No, this was cardinal Tollet's error; for the rule of interpretation (so the matter or circumstance be the same) would hold as true in any dialect or language whatsoever.

The question then is, What certain general rule we have, when, or in what cases, the conjunctive particle *and* doth produce this or the like disjunctive sense, or may warrant this or the like exposition of this law: *He that curseth father* and *mother shall surely die;* that is, *He which curseth* either *father* or *mother shall surely die.* For the like exposition, the rules are two. One general and infallible rule is this:

A rule to know when *and* may be changed into *or.*

'Whensoever the particle *and* doth couple, not two parts of one and the same proposition, but two entire propositions together, that which is thus conjunctively affirmed of two propositions coupled together must be disjunctively expounded of either proposition divided one from the other.' Now when it is said, *He that curseth father* and *mother shall die*, there be two entire propositions coupled together by this particle *and* implicitly; the explicit sense or resolution of which speech is this, *He that curseth his father shall surely die, and he that curseth his mother shall surely die.* And if both these propositions conjunctively taken be true, this disjunctive will be as true, *He that curseth either father or mother shall die.*

A second rule when *and* must be turned into *or.*

Secondly, the rule is universally true, 'When two incompatible attributes are conjunctively avouched of one and the same subject, in one and the same proposition universally taken, the particle *and* in this case must be resolved into the particle *or*, when the universal proposition or subject of it is divided into its

parts.' *Quæ dicuntur conjunctim de genere, dicuntur divisim de specie.* As, for example, the philosopher describing the native property of quantity, saith, 337
Maxime proprium est quantitati, ut ex ea dicantur res æquales et inæquales. But inasmuch as equality and inequality are incompatible, if we apply them to the same particular things which are compared together for quantity, hence it is, that every particular substance which is compared to or measured with another must either be equal or unequal unto it. That one and the same particular substance should be both equal and unequal to another for quantity is impossible. So the philosopher saith, (and it is a natural truth, which none can deny,) that the living or sensitive creature, universally taken, is rational and irrational; but, because one and the same living creature cannot be both rational and irrational, when we descend to particular living creatures, we cannot say that any of them is both rational and irrational, but either rational or irrational. Yet, inasmuch as every particular living creature is either endowed with reason or not endowed with reason, the living creature, universally taken, that is, as it comprehends every particular living creature, must be both rational and irrational; for, *Quicquid dicitur divisim de speciebus, dicitur conjunctim de genere.*

9. To give such a direct and punctual answer to the cardinal's instance out of Exod. xxi. 17, *He that curseth father and mother shall die,* as may satisfy all the rest which he brings or can be brought to like purpose, we say, as was intimated before, there be two entire propositions: 1. 'He that curseth his father shall die;' 2. 'He that curseth his mother shall die:' and the explication or unfolding of these two propositions is disjunctively set down by our Saviour

himself, Matt. xv. 4: *He that curseth father or mother shall surely die.* But there are not two propositions but one proposition in this text, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* He doth not say here or elsewhere, 'He that eateth my flesh dwelleth in me and I in him, and he that drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him.' Nor is this disjunctive any where in scripture expressed, 'That he which eateth Christ's flesh or drinketh his blood dwelleth in Christ and he in him.' That instance which the cardinal would wrest to justify his interpretation of our Saviour's words, John vi. 53. 56, doth make against him. His instance is 1 Cor. xi. 27: *Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.* For inasmuch as St. Paul had said before, ver. 26, that *as often as* we *eat this bread, and drink this cup,* we *do shew the Lord's death till he come,* it will necessarily follow, that albeit we eat the bread not unworthily, and yet (put such a case) drink the cup unworthily, we become guilty both of his body and blood, because in both we solemnize the memory of his death: and he that should both eat the bread and drink the cup unworthily is twice guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; as he that curseth both father and mother is worthy of double death, because he that curseth either father or mother is guilty of death. Nor can it be alleged that the several parts of this proposition, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me,* are incompatible, or cannot be performed at one and the same sacramental action by one and the same man; or that they are to be universally or collectively understood of the whole church, as consisting of priests and laics, and not distributively of every man: and

therefore to seek a disjunctive sense of these words to this or like effect, *He that eateth my flesh, or drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him,* is to seek a knot in a bulrush, or a division in unity.

Again, the form of our Saviour's speech, John vi. 53, is exceptive: *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* The form is the very same as if we should say, 'Except a man honour his father and mother, his 338
seed shall not long prosper upon earth:' now it would be impiously absurd to make this construction of that commandment, 'Except a man honour either his father or his mother, his seed shall not long prosper upon the earth.' And no better than thus is the construction which cardinal Tollet or his followers make of our Saviour's words in ver. 53. Our Saviour had told them before, that *he was the bread of life which came down from heaven;* and pressing the belief of this point upon them further, (not by division, but by addition,) he addeth, ver. 51, that *the bread* which he meant *was his flesh.* And when the Jews, ver. 52, strove about this, he further adds, ver. 53, *Verily, verily,.....Except ye eat.....and drink.....ye have no life in you.*

10. But, besides the former plunge whereto the best scholars in the Romish church are put, in justifying their practice for detaining the cup from the laity, if this chapter be meant of sacramental eating, there is another difficulty, which neither the late device of drinking Christ's blood *per concomitantiam,* nor the cardinal's interpretation of ver. 56. by disjunction, will any way touch, much less satisfy.

A difficulty arising from the words, if literally meant of sacramental eating.

And the difficulty is this: if these words be literally meant of sacramental eating and drinking, their literal sense must be as plain, and as void of all trope or metaphor, as the words of the institution related by

St. Matthew, chap. xxvi. 26, are by them supposed to be. Now when Christ saith in St. Matthew, *that the bread is his body*, this speech in the literal sense (as they contend) inferreth a substantial change of the bread into the substance of his body. Now our Saviour's words are in this place as plain and as certain as in that. He avoucheth again and again, that *he is the bread of life—that the bread which he will give is his flesh—that his flesh is meat indeed—that his blood is drink indeed.* Now if the sacramental bread in St. Matthew cannot literally be said to be his *body*, unless it be converted into the substance of his body, then cannot Christ himself literally be said to be *bread*, unless his substance be converted into the substance of bread. His flesh cannot literally be said *meat indeed*, unless it be really and substantially converted into meat—his blood cannot be said *drink indeed*, unless it be really transubstantiated into drink, if they grant these words to be meant of sacramental eating, or to be equivalent to the words of the institution. Now to deny these words to be meant of sacramental eating, is every way less expedient for reformed churches than for the Romish. And yet to restrain them, either to sacramental eating only, or to spiritual eating excluding sacramental, is worst of all. We are therefore to consider, that sacramental eating and spiritual eating are not opposite, or incompatible, but subordinate. Our eating of Christ's body, and drinking of Christ's blood, are then complete, when they are sacramentally spiritual, or spiritually sacramental. For, as Calvin excellently observes, (albeit such as profess themselves zealous followers of him, either do not understand him, or do not second him,) "To eat Christ's body, and drink Christ's blood, sacramentally, is more than to

believe in Christ, more than to have our faith awaked or quickened by the sacramental pledges." For no man can spiritually eat Christ, but by believing his death and passion; yet sacramental eating adds somewhat to spiritual eating, how quick and lively soever our faith be whilst we eat him only spiritually. For though our faith were in both the same, as well for degree as quality, yet the object of our faith is not altogether the same, at least the union of our faith unto the same object is not altogether the same, in sacramental and in spiritual eating. Christ's body and blood are so present in the sacrament, that we receive a more special influence from them in use of the sacrament than without it we do, so we receive it worthily, or 339
with hearts prepared by spiritual eating precedent, that is, by serious meditation of Christ's death and passion. It is not all one, either not to think on Christ's death and passion out of the sacrament, or to think on them negligently, or not reverently, and to receive the sacrament of his body and blood unworthily, negligently, or irreverently. Now as the effects or consequence of the unworthy receiving the holy sacrament is more dangerous than the effects or consequence of not eating Christ spiritually, or of careless meditation upon Christ's death and passion, so the effect of sacramental receiving, worthily and faithfully performed, is a greater refreshing to the soul, than the effect of receiving him spiritually only, though reverently and as becomes us. Now unto the reverent and worthy receiving of Christ's body and blood both ways, that is, both spiritually and sacramentally, as being the most complete performance of the condition required, is the promise of our Saviour most immediately annexed: *He that* so *eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* The meaning of

which promise was the second point proposed, paragraph 5, and should be next handled, but that the application here desireth to be inserted.

The application relating to the first general.

11. What hath been spelled apart, let us now put together. He that intends aright to eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood sacramentally, to his soul's health, must come prepared by a right and worthy receiving of both spiritually. Now we spiritually eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood, as often as we reverently and faithfully meditate upon Christ's death, and remember it aright. And this we do when we take a true estimate of ourselves, and of his death and sufferings for us. For this is both duly to examine ourselves, or our own souls, and rightly to esteem or discern the Lord's body. To discern his body from the bodies of other men we cannot, unless we believe and acknowledge it to be the body of the Son of God, the body of God blessed for ever: as was shewed at large before in other tracts, and in the forepart of this book. And this we may do, and yet not rightly esteem that love which Christ shewed unto us, in offering his body and blood, in respect of the love of others which would perhaps adventure their bodies and shed their blood for us.

Two duties: 1. To examine ourselves; 2. To discern the Lord's body.

12. To remember a good turn done by a friend, and not to value and prize it as we ought, is rather to forget than to remember his friendliness. Now no man can rightly prize the death of Christ, and the benefits thereof, unless he truly believe that Christ died for him. But is every one bound to believe this? Yes; he that doth not believe this, doth not believe that Christ is the Messias, or the Redeemer of the world. To doubt of this, is a degree of infidelity; to deny it, is more than heresy, a point of Jewish infidelity. Yet to believe thus much, and no more, doth not immediately make

a good Christian, or worthy receiver of the holy sacrament. What more then must every one believe? that Christ died for him in particular? Certainly he must. Nor doth the belief of this make him sure of his salvation. Every one must believe that Christ died for him in particular, that he may be a worthy receiver; and every one must worthily receive this holy sacrament, that is, worthily remember Christ's death, that he may make his election sure[y].

But in what sense must every one believe that Christ died for him in particular? Not exclusively, as if he died not for others as well as for him: for this were *to have the faith of Christ with respect of persons*, without charity, and contrary to reason. For if every one must believe that Christ died for him in 340
particular, then every man must believe that Christ died for all men as well as for him; otherwise some men should be bound to believe an untruth. But if he died for all men, how is he said to die for thee and me in particular? Very well; thus: though he died for all, as well as for thee or me, yet did he not die partly for thee, and partly for me, and partly for others, but entirely for every one.

13. Plato (as Seneca, in his 6th book De Beneficiis, cap. 18, tells us) thought himself obliged in kindness to one that had transported him over a river without paying his fare; he reckoned it *positum apud Platonem officium:* but when he saw others partakers of the same benefit, he disclaimed the debt. Hence Seneca draws this aphorism; "It is not enough for him that will oblige me unto him to do me a good turn, unless he do it as to myself directly;" *non tantum mihi, sed tanquam mihi.* If upon the like considerations, or to

[y] Of the first part of man's redemption, or the ransom paid for all, see book 9. chap. 5. [vol. viii. p. 216.]

the end that they may think themselves obliged to the Son of God more than other men are, some in our days have taught, that Christ did not only suffer all for them, but as for them in particular; all others (being not such as they deemed themselves to be, that is, not truly elect) being excluded from the benefit of his sufferings; this is the best use and most charitable construction that can be made of so unuseful and uncharitable a doctrine. Though to gather any good use from it is as impossible as to reap figs of thistles.

Howbeit, as well they who hold that Christ died for the elect only, as they which teach that he died for all, must beware lest they misapply that rule of Seneca's, touching ordinary benefits or common courtesies, unto that extraordinary lovingkindness of Christ's sufferings: *Quod debeo cum multis, solvam cum multis;* "That which I owe amongst others, I will not pay alone." His meaning is, that for common benefits he is only bound to pay his share or portion. Far be it from any one that nameth the name of the Lord Jesus to reason thus in his heart or secret thoughts: 'Christ died for the many hundreds of thousands now living, and for the more hundreds of ten thousands late or long since dead, as well as for me; therefore I owe him love and thankfulness, but, *pro rata*, (suppose the exact number was certainly known,) I am but to acknowledge such a part of his sufferings to have been undertaken for me as I am of that great multitude.' Every human soul is indebted to Christ for the whole, not every single man for his part of man's redemption. That which St. Bernard speaks, in a case not altogether the same, is most true of the benefits of Christ's sufferings: *Nec in multitudinem divisa sunt, nec ad paucitatem restricta:* if God's love to mankind be infinite, and if the value of Christ's

blood or sufferings be truly infinite, (as they truly be,) they cannot be divided amongst many, much less can they be restrained to some few; both these being against the nature of infinity. And if the value of Christ's sufferings cannot be divided into parts, every one must acknowledge that he paid an infinite price for his redemption in particular. A price less than infinite could not have redeemed any one of us, and a price more than infinite could not be given for all. If Christ became a second Adam, to die and suffer for redeeming man, he died and suffered for all men, for every man, albeit the number of men which proceed from the first Adam could be infinite. Had it been the will or purpose of the Son of God to have taken upon him the form of a servant, immediately upon the first woman's sin of disobedience, his sufferings for her could not have sufficed, unless they had been of value infinite: and being of value infinite for her, they had been of the same value for every living soul that issued from her to the world's end.

If then the price he laid down for thee were infinite, 341
that is, without measure or bounds, thy love and thankfulness to him must be without stint or limit. Though he died for others as well as thee, yet art thou bound to love him no less than if he had died for thee alone. Thus must thou think of Christ's death and passion, if thou remember it aright: and as often as thou readest, hearest, or makest confession with thy lips, that *Christ's blood was shed for thee*, make this comment or paraphrase in thine heart—'He shed his whole blood for me, every drop that fell from him, either in the garden or on the cross, or elsewhere, was poured out for my sake, for me in particular.' Yea, every one which hears of Christ is bound to believe that he died for him, and as for him, that the benefit of his passion

redounds *et mihi, et tanquam mihi:* and charity, if it spring from faith, will teach us to exclude none from title to the benefits of Christ's death and sufferings.

14. This doctrine of Christ's dying for all, of his purpose to dissolve the works of Satan in all, I am bold to profess in every place where Christ's name is called upon, in every place where I have or may have opportunity to make Christ known: the bolder, because it sets forth, not only the love and mercy, but the justice of God, a great deal more than the contrary doctrine can do. It makes man's sinfulness and unthankfulness appear much greater, than by the contrary doctrine can be apprehended or acknowledged. Besides, it makes our ministry of preaching more useful than otherwise it could be. For, if we grant that Christ died only for the elect, we might acquit ourselves with safety of conscience from the burden of preaching or catechising, save only in those congregations which we know to be of the number of the elect, or men already regenerate. Howbeit, even in respect of them, our preaching could not be so useful, as it would be harmful to others. We could but testify that to the elect which they already know, that is, that they shall be saved. But if once we teach that the elect only, or some few (perhaps one of a thousand, not one of five hundred) have any interest in Christ's sufferings, every man which is not as yet regenerate, nor in the state of election, would forthwith conclude, that it is a thousand to one (more than five hundred to one) that he can receive no benefit from Christ's sufferings, having no interest in the everlasting inheritance purchased by them. And were it not much better to be silenced, than by our preaching to put such stumblingblocks in their ways whom we are sent to call unto Christ? For we are not sent *to call the righteous*, or men

Three uses of the doctrine, that Christ paid the ransom for all.

already regenerate, *but sinners to repentance*, to the state of regeneration.

How true soever in the event it may prove, that but a few shall be saved in respect of them that perish, though the most part of men do die in their sins, yet their blood shall be required at their hands who have taught, that they could not be saved, that Christ did not die, did not suffer for them. But if we teach, as God in his word hath taught us [z], that Christ died and suffered for all men, no man can doubt whether Christ died for him or no; and not doubting that Christ died for him, he need not despair of salvation by him: we leave him without excuse for not repenting and seeking Christ.

Again, this same doctrine sets forth the glory of God much more than the other can. For albeit God's mercies unto one man be truly infinite, or rather infinite in themselves, yet if according to this infinity they be extended unto all, they are extensively much greater. If God had created only these inferior elements, and man, their creation would necessarily infer the infinity of his power, (for without infinite power nothing could have been made of nothing,) but yet his 342
praise or glory would not have appeared so great in the creation of earth and water, as it doth in the creation, not of them only, but of the whole heavens, with all their hosts and furniture. The more God's creatures be, the greater be his praises; for this tribute he ought to receive from all of them, for their very being. In like manner, though the redemption of one or some few men, do truly argue the value of his sufferings to be truly infinite; yet the more they be for whom he died, the more is his glory, the greater is his praise: for all

[z] John i. 29; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15; Heb. ii. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 1.

are bound jointly and severally to laud and magnify his name for the infinite price of their redemption.

15. Lastly, this doctrine is so necessary for manifesting the just measure of their unthankfulness which perish, that without this we cannot take so much as a true surface of it; not so much as the least dimension of sin. Some there be which tell us, "that we had power in Adam to glorify God, but, that sinning in Adam, our sin is infinite, because against an infinite Majesty: for so it is, that the greater the party is whom we offend, the greater always the offence is." And thus by degrees they gather, that every sin against the infinite Majesty of God deserveth infinity of punishment. But albeit the degrees of sin, which accrue from the degrees of dignity in the person whom we offend, be successively infinite [a]; yet because these degrees are indeterminate, every man, which hath any skill at all in arguments of proportion, must needs know, that it is impossible for the wit or art of man to find out the true product of such calculatory inductions, or to conjecture unto what set measure of ingratitude these infinite degrees will amount. It is not the ten-hundredth-thousandth part of any sin that can be truly notified unto us by inferences of this kind. How then shall we take the true measure of our sins, or the full dimension of our unthankfulness? From the great goodness of God in our creation, and the unmeasurable love of Christ in our redemption. If God in our creation (as the psalmist says) did make us but little lower than the glorious angels, that he might afterward crown us with glory everlasting; if, when through the first man's folly we had lost that honour, he made his only Son for a little while, for thirty-three years'

[a] See book 8. [vol. vii. p. 379.]

space, lower than the angels, that he might exalt him above all principality and power, and in him recrown us with honour and glory equal to the angels, their sin is truly infinite, their unthankfulness is unexpressible, and justly deserveth punishment everlasting, who voluntarily and continually despise so great salvation, which by Christ was purchased for them. No torment can be too great, no anguish too durable, because no happiness could be in any degree comparable, much less equal, to that which they refused, though treasured up for them in that inexhaustible fountain of happiness, Christ Jesus our Lord, our God, and our Redeemer.

To conclude this meditation: it is a thing most seriously to be considered, that though God's mercies in Christ can never be magnified too much, yet may they be apprehended amiss: and that as it is most dangerous to sink in deep waters, wherein it is the easiest to swim, so, the more infinite God's mercies towards us are, the more deadly sin it is to dally with them, or to take encouragement by the contemplation of them to continue in sin. The contemplation of their infinity is then most seasonable, when we are touched with a feeling of the infiniteness of our sins. In that case, we cannot look upon them but we shall be desirous to be partakers of them, and that upon such terms as God offers them, *the forsaking of all our sins.* Proverbs xxviii. 13.

Dangerous to dally with God's mercies.

16. But is this all that thou art to remember, when 343
thou art, by spiritual eating and drinking Christ's flesh and blood, a preparing thyself for sacramental and spiritual receiving him together in the Lord's supper? is it enough to acknowledge, that he paid as great a ransom for thee as he did for all mankind in general? No! this is but the first part of thy redemption: and this first part of thy redemption was entirely, and all-sufficiently, and most effectually wrought for thee,

before any part of thy body was framed, before thy soul was created: it was then wrought for thee without any endeavour or wish of thine: no more was required at thy hands for this work, than was required of thee for thy creation. But there is a second part of thy redemption, of which that saying of a father is true, *Qui fecit te sine te, non salvabit te sine te*, "He that made thee without any work or endeavour of thine, will not save (will not redeem) thee, without some endeavour at least on thy part."

What then is the second part of the redemption, which we expect that Christ should yet work in us and for us? or what is the endeavour on our parts required that he should work it in us and for us? The second part of our redemption, which is yet in most of us to be accomplished, is, the mortification of our bodies, the diminishing the reign of sin in them; in a word, our sanctification, or ratification of our election. These are wholly Christ's works, the sole works of God; for *it is he that works in us both the will and the deed:* and yet are we commanded *to work out our own salvation; to make our election sure* [b]. But how shall we do this, which is wholly God's work? or what are we to do, that these works may be wrought in us? Besides the renewing of the astipulation or answer of a pure conscience, and resumption of our BAPTISMAL VOW [c], heretofore mentioned, we are to humble ourselves mightily before the Lord, by a meek acknowledgment of our vileness, and sincere confession of our sins. And if we so humble ourselves, he that *giveth grace to the humble* will lift us up; *if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness;* not only to remit and

[b] See book 10. chap. 31. [vol. ix. p. 212.]

[c] Book 10. chap. 50. [vol. ix. p. 543.]

eover our iniquities, but to purify our hearts, and renew our spirits and minds, that they shall bring forth fruits unto holiness. We are to call upon God by the prayer of faith and perseverance: *Turn thou us, good Lord, and so shall we be turned; speak but thou the word, and thy servants shall be whole.*

A second duty, to examine ourselves.

17. Thus we may esteem of Christ's love to us, and yet not examine or judge ourselves as we ought before we eat this bread and drink this cup. To examine and judge ourselves aright requires these two meditations, or two parts of one and the same meditation. First, how far we are guilty of Christ's death by our sins. But this falls under the former meditation, that Christ died for us all, not only all jointly considered, but for every one in particular, or as alone considered; and if he died for every one in particular, or as alone considered, then every one may and must thus judge, *then were all dead*, and every one in particular was a true cause of his death. And this meditation will make easy way to the second, or second part of the same meditation, which is this: Wherein, or in what respects, every one of us doth wrong Christ Jesus more, or may do him more wrong than they did, which actually wrought his death: that is, than Annas and Caiaphas, than the scribes and Pharisees, than the priests and elders, that plotted and conspired it, did.

But doth any man which professes Christianity at this day wrong him more than Annas and Caiaphas and their associates did? Yes, a great many! All that both daily and hourly do that which is more against his most holy will, than all that Annas and 344
Caiaphas and the Roman soldiers did unto him, wrong him more than they did in putting him to death. "The only rule for measuring any personal wrong, is, the opposition which the act or practice bears or includes

unto the will or liking of the party which is displeased or wronged."

To apply this to our present purpose. Annas and Caiaphas and their complices did our Saviour more wrong, than Cain did Abel, his innocent brother, when he took away his life. For death, especially a violent death, was as bitter unto Christ, as man, as it was to Abel. So were the revilings, the slanders, and the defamations which the people (by the instigation of the priests, scribes, and Pharisees) cast upon him, most displeasing to his human will. Yet were all these personal wrongs more unpleasant to his most holy will as he was the Son of God, than unto his human nature, than unto his disposition or affection, as he was the Son of David. And albeit he suffered nothing which his heavenly Father had not foredetermined, yet he that would excuse his persecutors from doing him wrong, were worse than an infidel. Neither will this excuse us from doing him greater wrong than these his persecutors did, if we do those things which are more displeasant to him, more contrary, not only to his divine, but even to his human will and nature, now glorified in heaven, than all the wrongs which Satan and his instruments did unto him, whilst he lived here on earth, whilst he was partaker of mortality with us.

18. But what do we? or what can we do more displeasant to his holy will, than what they did, who maliciously accused him, who more maliciously sought his condemnation, who, after his condemnation, did more maliciously and inhumanly treat and persecute him, than any barbarian would do a malefactor which had yielded himself to a legal trial?

Surely, if we do those things which he is more unwilling we should do than he was to suffer all the

indignities which the scribes and Pharisees could put upon him, than all the torments which the Roman laws could inflict upon him, we wrong him much more than either the Jews or the Roman soldiers did. For he did not suffer either the torments which seized upon him whilst he was upon the cross or in the garden, because he could not avoid or resist them, but because he was more willing to suffer all these, than a greater inconvenience which should have befallen all and every one of us, unless these mischiefs (as the world accounts them) had befallen him. The inconveniences which he sought to prevent by voluntary undergoing these calamities, were, the dominion or reign of sin in us, and our servitude unto Satan by this reign of sin. For *for this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might dissolve* or *destroy the works of the devil.* And his manifestation did contain, not only his incarnation, but his exemplary persecution, his death and passion, which he was more willing to undergo, than to suffer the works of Satan, in any one of us, to be undissolved. If we then shall hold on his side, or seek to keep him in, whom Christ came to cast out, or shall build again that Babel which Christ came to destroy; if we take part with Satan, as all those do which do those things whereby the works of Satan may be maintained or augmented, whereby the reign or sovereignty of Satan may be confirmed or enlarged, we do those things which are more displeasing to Christ than his death and passion was. And by doing such things, (according to the former rule,) we wrong him more than they did, which did conspire or complot his death, than they did, which put him to that most cruel ignominious death: for he was more willing to suffer that death, to 345
suffer all the indignities that the devil or world could put upon him, than to suffer us, any one of us, to live

and die in our sins, and in the servitude and power of Satan. Thus much by way of application, as relating to the first general: proceed we now to the second general, *He ..... dwelleth in me, and I in him.* John vi. 56.

The second general.

19. *Dwelleth in me, and I in him;* or *abideth in me, and I in him.*

The word in the original varies its signification according to the circumstances of matters handled. Sometimes it signifies no more than *to abide* or *remain*, though but for an hour or two. Sometimes it necessarily imports as much as our English expresseth in the text, that is, a *dwelling* or *mansion*. From this real difference of the matter and circumstance, the word μένει is by our English one while expressed (as here it is) by *dwelling*, another while by *abiding* or *remaining*, within the compass of one period. For example, John i. 38, 39, John's two disciples ask our Saviour, *Rabbi,* ποῦ μένεις, *where dost thou dwell? And he saith unto them, Come and see. They came and saw where he dwelt;* Ἦλθον καὶ εἶδον ποῦ μένει· καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ ἔμειναν τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην, *and abode with him that day.* Though the word in the original be in all three places the same, and though the translators had twice rendered it by *dwelling*, yet in the third place, they do not say, *and they* dwelt, but, *they* abode *with him that day.* Every *dwelling* includes an *abiding*, but every *abiding* doth not include or imply a *dwelling*. *Dwelling* implies a constant or frequent place of abode; and somewhat more than so, a place of known or professed abode, no lurking-hole or sculking-place. All these circumstances concur to justify the translation of the original word here rather by *dwelling* than by *abiding*. For Christ's *abiding* in us (if we so eat his flesh and drink his blood as he prescribes) is con-

stant, is frequent, and perpetual. And whilst he abides in us, our abiding in him is not only constant and frequent, but the known or professed place of our abode (and it is the best profession to be of his household). It is he that feeds us in time of peace, and he is our tower of defence in time of war, the rock of our salvation whilst we are beset with death and danger. *Be thou,* saith the psalmist, psalm lxxi. 3, *my strong habitation, whereunto I may continually resort: thou hast given commandment to save me; for thou art my rock and my fortress.*

But that Christ is the rock of our salvation, of our habitation in distress, is a point which needs no further proof, no amplification. Yet seeing he is *our dwelling-place,* the rock of our habitation in whom we dwell, how can he be said *to dwell in us?* An house may be said to be in the city, but may we say that the city is in the house? Men dwell in houses or tents, but was it ever heard that houses or tents did dwell in men that are the lords and owners of them? The branch may abide in the tree, so may the graft in the stock; but who would say, that the tree abideth in the branch, or the stock in the graft? How then is it said, that the rock both of our salvation and habitation, the sanctuary of our souls in all distress, *doth dwell in us?* How can he, who is the Root of Jesse, (*the Root of David,* Rev. v. 5,) the true vine, which God's own right hand hath planted, abide in us, who are but wild slips, lately ingrafted into the stem from which the natural branches were broken off?

Though a man be in the house as the dweller, the house may be in the man, as the right owner, possessor, and householder.

20. The difficulty arising from this doubled comparison, though really but one, must be handled in two:

Two difficulties.

First, How Christ may be said to dwell in us and we in him.

Secondly, How he may be said to abide in us, and not we in him only.

346 This mutual inhabitation and reciprocal abode or inbeing is very mystical and admirable. Yet may our apprehension of it be facilitated by observing some resemblances thereof in other things far different. To name that first which is worst. That possession of the body of man which evil spirits did usurp in our Saviour's time, is in holy scripture oft set down in terms denoting the evil spirits being in the man: Mat. xii. 45, *They enter in and dwell there;* and chap. viii. 31, *If thou cast us out, suffer us to go away into the herd of swine;* and Acts xix. 16, *The man in whom the evil spirit was:* yet doth St. Mark, chap. i. 23, and chap. v. 2, express this in the original as if the man was in an evil spirit: ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ. Logic and philosophy tell us, that the whole is in the parts, and the parts in the whole; whether it be a *totum potentiale* or *universale*, (as *genus*, which is in the *species*, and the *species* likewise in the *genus*,) or whether it be *totum collectivum:* so the city is in the several families or households, and these again are in the city. Some good divines have taken notice of that speech or expression, *Enter thou into thy Master's joy*, as importing the wondrous amplitude thereof: it is such as cannot be comprehended or contained within him, but he must enter into it. Yet sure that joy doth both satiate the soul and replenish the body of him that enters into it: he is as if we could suppose a large vessel of crystal or transparent gold let down into a sea of nectar or living waters. But the expressions of scripture about God the Father's *being in Christ*, and *Christ in him* and *in us*, and of our *being in him*, and of Christ and his holy Spirit *being in us*[d], are various, especially in St. John, chap. xiv. 10, 11, 16, 17, 20, 23, and perhaps more easy to be experimented by the

[d] John xvii. 11, 21, 22, 23, 26.

Christian union with God, than to be explained in words more easy than the texts themselves.

21. To let these pass then. The proposed difficulties must have their proper solutions: the former, from the explication of that great attribute of Christ, to wit, that he is *the chief corner stone*, &c.: the other difficulty refers to that metaphor of the vine and the branches, or of the stock and the grafts.

The former difficulty explained.

Christ is compared unto a *stone* or *rock*, and we unto *living stones* built upon it, in respect of the strength and firmness of the foundation and structure of God's house or temple.

He is again rightly compared to the *vine*, to an *olive* or other more fruitful tree, and we unto *branches* or *grafts* (not springing from the root, but ingrafted into it) in respect of our growth in him, and of the diffusion of his virtue into us and through us.

That we are built upon Christ, (as the apostle saith, Eph. ii. 20,) this doth argue that *we dwell in him*, that he is the rock of our habitation. In that we are built on him, as on the chief corner stone; not under him only, as he is *summus angularis lapis*, "the chief stone at the top," but upon him as *lapis imus*, "the first foundation stone" too, and that a living stone, which was cut out of the mountain without hands, and which was to grow into a mountain filling the whole earth; this infers, that he must *dwell in us*. For the stone which Daniel speaks of did not become a great mountain, so great a mountain as should fill all the earth, by addition, or by heaping or building one stone upon another, but by the growth of life; that is, by increase or augmentation of the same stone. Did this stone then increase or grow from small beginnings unto a mountain overspreading the whole earth? If this

we say, the Rock of our salvation or habitation must receive increase of life, and become a greater habitation or dwellingplace in this last age than he had been in any former. But how should this be true, seeing he is and was the Rock of ages, the Rock on which the
347 world itself is founded, the Rock by which the earth itself, which supporteth all other rocks, is supported, Heb. i. 3?

22. Such a rock he was from eternity as he is God, not as he is man. As man, he was first as a little stone, yet a growing stone, for *he grew in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man*, Luke ii. 52. As God, he could not be the corner stone which God had promised to lay in Sion. Yet was Christ, who was both God and man, that stone which was laid in Sion. And as he which was both God and man did suffer for us, was raised again the third day from the dead, not according to his Godhead, but according to his manhood; so was he (the same Christ, which was both God and man) the stone laid in Sion, not according to his Godhead, but according to his manhood. This gives us the ordinary interpretation of the prophet Isaiah, chap. xxviii. 16; but a late interpreter of prophecies or visions hath observed an hypallage, or inversion in these words, not infrequent in the prophets, familiar (as he allegeth) to the Hebrew writers, such an inversion as grammarians observe in that of the poet:

> In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas
> Corpora. Ovid. Met. I. 1.

that is, "forms changed into new bodies," for "bodies changed into new forms." Thus, saith this late interpreter[f], when the prophet saith, *Mitto lapidem in*

[e] Isaiah viii. 14; Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6. [f] Anton. Fernandius, cited in the next chapter.

Sionem—I lay or *place a stone in Zion*—the meaning is as if he had said, "I lay or found Zion, the spiritual Zion or new Jerusalem, in a stone, or chief corner stone, elect and precious." But whether this be the grammatical or literal sense of the prophet, I leave for critics in the Hebrew dialect to determine. Both constructions, the ordinary and this critical, are true and compatible; both in respect of the matter are necessary. Christ, God and man, was laid in Zion as a sure foundation stone, as *imus angularis lapis*, as the lowest corner stone, unto which St. Peter, for precedency of time (so far we yield unto his primacy) was first annexed. Peter was the first living stone which was built upon this foundation stone; the other apostles were laid, not upon Peter, but upon the same foundation stone; whether one after another, or all together, we will not dispute. However, all that believe as Peter and the other apostles did, or shall so believe unto the world's end, are immediately laid upon the same foundation stone, not one upon another, no one of them upon Peter, or upon any other apostle; their union or annexion unto Christ is as immediate as Peter's was, and is or shall be as indissoluble as his was to Christ, albeit their growth be not so great, nor for quality so glorious. The best inscription of this edifice thus immediately erected upon the same stone would be that of the poet, *Crescit crescentibus illis.* As the number of living stones which are laid upon this foundation stone increases, so the foundation or corner stone which God did promise to lay in Zion doth still increase. As every particular living stone increaseth or groweth from a stone into a pillar of this house of God; from a pillar in the house of God, unto a temple of God; so this foundation stone, that is, Christ as man, still groweth, still increaseth, not in himself, but in them. For they

grow by his growth in them, or by diffusion of life from him into them.

The second difficulty explained.

23. But though Christ be often called *a stone, a rock, a living stone, a living rock*, or *a stone which being cut out of a mountain became a mountain which filled all the earth;* yet the manner of his growth in us, or the manner of his enlarged habitation through the church, may be best conceived by the manner of the soul's growth or diffusion of his virtue throughout vegetable or sensible bodies, that is, through trees or plants, or through the bodies of men, of beasts, or such
348 as we call living creatures. There is a vegetable soul in the acorn when it is first set or planted, and this soul we may truly say *dwelleth* or *abideth* in the acorn, and is the cause why the acorn sprouteth into a rod: the same soul is the cause why the rod or twig groweth greater, the true cause why this twig groweth into a stem, why the stem grown greater spreads itself into branches, why every branch beareth leaf, blossom, or seed. Now the greater the stem doth grow, the further the vegetable soul doth spread itself; the same vegetable soul which was in the acorn diffuseth itself into the stem, into the branches, into the leaf, into the blossom, into the fruit or seed. None of these could thrive or prosper at all, unless the vegetable soul did *abide* or *dwell* in them—none of them can thrive or prosper any longer than the vegetable soul *abideth* or *dwelleth* in them[g]. Thus was Christ the root out of which St. Peter sprouted, the soul of Peter as he was a living or spiritual man. He had no life but from Christ, he grew by Christ *dwelling* or *abiding* in him. And as he did grow by Christ *abiding* in him, so he bare fruit by Christ's *dwelling* in him, by the diffusion of life and vegetation from Christ. And so all they,

[g] See John xv. 2—7, where the abode is mutual.

that abiding in Christ do grow in faith, grow by Christ dwelling in them, and spreading his virtue through them, after such a manner as the vegetable soul doth diffuse itself throughout the branches which spring from the root or stem, or through the branches which are ingrafted or inoculated into it. And this manner of the vegetable soul's diffusion of itself (or of its virtue) into all the branches which are ingrafted into the same stock or root, doth better resemble the manner of Christ's dwelling in us, than the diffusion of life or vegetation from the root into the stems, stovens, or branches, which without ingraffing or inoculation naturally spring from it.

24. But this latter similitude of the stock and grafts, although it well express the manner of Christ's *abiding* or growing, not in himself, but in us, and the manner of our *abiding* or *dwelling* in him, it may seem to fail in this—that ordinary stocks, howsoever the ingrafted branches be supported by them, and receive life and nutriment from them, yet do they not receive their specifical kind of life from the stocks into which they are ingrafted, but still retain their own native quality: as a good apple or pear grafted into a crab stock or thorn doth not degenerate into a crab or thorn, but retains its native sweetness, and bears the same fruit which it would have done, although it had grown up into a tree from its own root, or from the root whereof it was a native branch. It would be a solecism to say, that any such stock doth remain or dwell in the graft, because it doth not diffuse its specifical quality into it. But Christ in this manner *abideth* or *dwelleth* in us. He is the root and stem, and we the grafts and inset branches, and yet he is said as truly *to dwell in us, as we in him.* This argues that the manner of our ingrafting and abiding in him is not

natural, because the stock or stem is for nature and quality much better than all the branches or grafts which are supported by it, which receive life and nutriment by it. Hence saith the apostle, Rom. xi. 24, that we Gentiles *were cut out of the olive tree which was wild by nature, and were graffed contrary to nature into a good olive tree.* This ingraftment is contrary unto nature two ways:

First, in that the grafts being wild by nature, without any root, or fat, or sweetness in themselves, grow better qualified than they were, by participation of the sweetness of the stock.

Secondly, in that the stock whereinto they are ingrafted is a good olive; whereas the olive tree naturally admits no ingraftment or incision, being by nature so fat, that it seems to envy or scorn to partici-
349 pate his fatness unto any other branches. *In arbore pingui non vivunt insita,* "Grafts do not thrive or prosper in any fat tree or stock," saith a late naturalist. And as an Hebrew doctor hath observed, the olive being the fattest of trees, will admit no incision nor ingraftment. Nor will any olive graft thrive or prosper, unless it be ingrafted in an hungry stock. That fatness is as peculiar to the olive, as sweetness to the fig or vine, besides experience, we have the authority of scripture, Judges ix. 8—11: *The trees went forth on a time to anoint a king over them; and they said unto the olive tree, Reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honour God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the trees said to the fig tree, Come thou, and reign over us. But the fig tree said unto them, Should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit,* &c.? Yet is Christ Jesus the true olive tree, but left his fatness for a time, that we, being

by nature wild olives, might be ingrafted into him, and being ingrafted might participate of his fatness and sweetness, which is no other than that whereof the natural olive is the emblem, to wit, *peace*, even *the peace of God which passeth all understanding*[g]. Peace was his embassage; as the apostle saith—*He is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us*, &c. *and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.* Eph. ii. 14. 17.

CHAP. V.

The great Attribute of Christ (his being the chief corner Stone) handled in the foregoing Chapter, prosecuted more amply in this. Christ is the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. How Christians being built upon this Foundation do grow unto an holy Temple.

EPHESIANS II. 20, 21.

And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord.

1. THE sum of our apostle's speech in this chapter (whereof these words are the conclusion) is this; That these Ephesians, who were Gentiles by progeny, far off from God, and aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, had now the privilege of God's saints, were *fellowcitizens with them, and of the household of God;* as it is, ver. 19. And to assure them of this privilege or prerogative, he adds, ver. 20, that they *were built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.* Jesus Christ was the best foundation, the only

[g] John xiv. 27; Philipp. iv. 7.

foundation, which could give this prerogative to the apostles or prophets, to be either saints or of the household of God. And he it is that gave to these Ephesians, though by nature Gentiles, and that gives to all, whosoever are built upon this corner stone, the like privilege; a privilege or prerogative to be native parts of that holy temple, which Jesus Christ came down from heaven to build here on earth.

Three points to be discussed.

2. The points then to be discussed are three:

First, What is meant by *the foundation of the prophets and apostles.*

350 Secondly, In what manner Christ is said to be *the chief corner stone.*

Thirdly, The manner how we are built upon the foundation here meant, or upon this corner stone, with the manner of our *growth into an holy temple.*

First, Whatsoever be here meant by *the foundation*, it is not restrained to any one prophet or apostle. The meanest prophet is not excluded: Moses and Samuel are to be numbered amongst the prophets here meant, they were no foundations of the rest. Nor is Peter here included as the foundation of the other apostles, but as a joint part of this foundation, or of the building erected upon it, whether we consider his person or doctrine. Many interpreters of good note understand the doctrine of the apostles and prophets: so saith Hugo Cardinalis, *Super doctrinam apostolorum et prophetarum.* But every sound doctrine must have a sure foundation. What then is the foundation of the apostolic and prophetical doctrine? That can be no other than the corner stone here mentioned; to wit, Christ Jesus, God and man. Are not the apostles then true foundations of this building? or will not St. John's words, Rev. xxi. 14, infer thus much? *And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and*

in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb. Surely neither his words nor the circumstance of the place will conclude that the twelve apostles were *the twelve foundations,* but only that their names were inscribed in them. So were not, for aught we read, the names of the prophets; nor can it be concluded that St. John did mean the selfsame thing by *the twelve foundations* that St. Paul here doth by *the foundation of the prophets and the apostles.* St. John describes the new Jerusalem as *a city lying four square, with twelve gates: three on the east, and three on the north; three on the south, and three on the west; bearing the inscription of the twelve tribes of Israel:* and having twelve gates, it must needs have twelve foundations, that is, the whole foundation is divided into twelve parts. The apostles were in no other sense the twelve foundations, than the twelve tribes of Israel were the twelve gates. Yet foundations the apostles might be said of this city, in such a sense as Hesychius saith St. Andrew was of St. Peter, because he brought him to Christ. Thus the whole Christian world was by the apostles brought unto Christ, as to *the only sure foundation* which God had promised to lay in Zion, or (as the Hebraism imports) on which, or in which, God had promised to build up Zion, that is, in St. John's language, *the new Jerusalem.* Christ then was the *chief corner stone,* on which the prophet foretold Zion should be re-erected; *the foundation* on which the apostles themselves were laid: and we should no way swerve from the meaning of St. Paul, if by *the foundation of the prophets and apostles* we neither understand their persons nor their doctrine, or neither of these only or especially, but the selfsame *foundation* upon which the prophets and apostles were built, by whose virtue they grew to be living stones

of this edifice: *for other foundation* than this corner stone *can no man lay;* nor did Christ himself build upon any other foundation than upon himself. He is the only *foundation*, whether of the apostles' persons or doctrine. I am the bolder to commend this interpretation unto you, because I see it ingenuously acknowledged by a late learned Jesuit[h], who (I think) learned it of Thomas Aquinas—*Superædificati supra fundamentum apostolorum; id est, Christum, qui est fundamentum apostolorum.*

351 3. But in what sense is Christ said to be *the chief corner stone?* In the interpretation of the original word, I find the diversity to be greater than the real difference. Some translate the original, ἀκρογωνιαίου, *summo angulari lapide, the highest* or *supreme corner stone*, which couples or binds the building. Beza will have it, *imo angulari lapide, the lowest stone in the corner*, which we call *the foundation stone;* and which in buildings (especially consecrated to sacred use) is commonly laid with great solemnity, and by the hands of some principal man or public officer. And Beza well observes, that the Greek ἄκρον, which is the epithet or title of *the corner stone* here in the text, doth signify both extremes of any dimension, as well the lowest as the highest; and he gives this good caveat withal, that we are not to press this comparison of Christ to a *corner stone* too far, no further than our apostle meant it: which was the *joining of*

The second point.

Beza's observation.

[h] Anton. Fernand. Conimb. Visiones Vet. Test. vis. 2. c. 28. Gen. fol. 83. sect. 6. num. 9. And Benedictus Ferdinandus Borb. Lusit. in his second tom. of Comments, upon Gen. cap. 28. sect. 2. num. 8. fol. 568. saith, Rom. ecclesia — est turris — fundatur in Petri confessione atque in Domini promissione.—And a little after he cites St. Athanasius, lib. 2. De Trin.: Optime S. Athanasius; Unum hoc est immobile fundamentum, una hæc est felix fidei petra Petri ore confessa, *Tu es Filius Dei vivi*, &c.

two walls together, which before had been distant and unsociable; to wit, the Jew and the Gentile.

Now in every complete building there must be more than two walls, four at the least, and therefore four corner stones, four *imi angulares lapides*, four "foundation stones," and four *summi angulares lapides*, that is, four "supreme" or "binding corner stones;" and all these corner stones are said to be the *chief* in the building. It is evident that Christ is the first foundation stone, and yet may it not be denied that he is also the chief corner stone which binds the building. For in this sense must that of the psalmist, psalm cxviii. 22. be understood: *The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.* For if we respect the literal sense of this prophecy, or the ground of the metaphor, the lowest or foundation stone being once refused by the builders, cannot by the same builders be laid in the foundation again, unless they will pull down what they have built: but whilst the foundation is in laying, a stone may be rejected, or laid aside by the builders, as not so fitting to be laid in the foundation, (or to be any intermediate part of the edifice erected,) and yet may come to be the fittest stone for coupling or binding the building; that is, to be the supreme corner stone. The author of the Scholiastic History hath a tradition, for whose authority he perhaps could have produced better warrant than we can take from him, that in the building of the second temple (at whose consecration, in all probability, this psalm cxviii. was conceived) there was a peculiar stone often laid aside by the builders, as unfitting (in their judgment) to become any part of the foundation or intermediate building, which yet afterwards proved the fittest corner stone for binding or coupling together the walls erected. And the extra-

ordinary unexpected fitness of this stone to finish that building, for whose erection it was continually held unfit, did minister hint or occasion unto the psalmist to say, *This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes.*

But leaving the truth or probability of this tradition to the search of antiquaries or critics, the literal or emblematical sense, which the author makes of the psalmist, doth well suit with the allegorical and mystical, which the apostles St. Paul here, Eph. ii. 20, 21, and St. Peter, Acts iv. 11, from our Saviour's mouth, have made of the psalmist's parabolical speech. For thus our Saviour Christ (whom God had presented and commended to the masterbuilders of his temple, that is, to the priests, scribes, and Pharisees, to the elders and chief rulers of the synagogue, in the days of his humiliation here on earth,) was by them rejected, scoffed and spurned at, and lastly buried in the earth, as altogether useless and unfit for building. And yet, after his resurrection, he became not only *imus*, but
352 *summus angularis lapis*, not only the first firm corner stone or supporter, but the chief and supreme corner stone too; as well the finishing as the foundation of this spiritual temple not made with hands. That Christ himself is both the foundation and finisher, that is, both the highest perfection and lowest foundation in this building, his own interpretation of the psalmist's words, Matt. xxi. 42. 44, will necessarily infer. *Did ye never read*, saith he, *in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes? And whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.* Fall upon this corner stone they could not,

but as it was the lowest in the building. Their fall upon it could not be so grievous as to break their limbs, unless it had been laid deeper or lower than ordinary foundations or corner stones are usually laid. And the mystical sense of our Saviour's words is, that such as spurned and stumbled at him, in his humility, should as it were break their limbs; but that this stone should fall upon any, this in the literal sense supposeth that it should be higher than they were, so high placed in this building, that the fall of it should not bruise or break their limbs, but grind their bones to powder. And thus was the Jewish nation broken or cut off from being God's people, for their contempt of Christ in his humility. And not only they, but all such as continue in the like contempt of his passion and resurrection, shall, by his second coming (to judgment) in glory, be ground to powder; that is, the pains of their first breaking, by falling upon this corner stone, shall be multiplied without end or measure.

To conclude this second point; Christ is both *lapis summus angularis, lapis imus, primus et latissimus angularis;* as Pineda saith, on Job xxxviii. 6: the highest and the lowest corner stone in this building, the centre and circumference, the whole strength of this city and the walls about it: so saith the prophet, Isaiah xxvi. 1, 2: *We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. Open ye the gates, that the righteous nation which keepeth the truth may enter in.* And again, ver. 4: *Trust ye in the Lord for ever: for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength:* or, as the Hebrew, *the rock of ages.* As this spiritual temple in the text is a temple not made with hands, (for God dwelleth not in such temples, Acts vii. 48. Heb. ix. 11, 24,) so Christ, who

is the chief corner stone of it, is that stone which Nebuchadnezzar saw in visions by night, Dan. ii. 34, 35: a stone not cut out of any quarry by hands, yet a stone which smote the image upon the feet, which were of iron and clay, and broke not them only, but the whole image, as well the brass, the gold and silver, as the iron and clay, to pieces: and afterwards became a great mountain, which filled the whole earth. But how or when this stone became a great mountain, or in what manner we are said to grow unto an holy temple, will better appear in discussing the third point proposed, which was, concerning the manner how these Ephesians or others are said to be built upon the foundation of the prophets and the apostles, and upon Jesus Christ the chief corner stone; and how they grow unto an holy temple.

The third point propounded, parag. 2.

4. When the prophet saith that the stone cut without hands *did become a great mountain*, he supposeth that it should be a living stone. And when our apostle here saith that the whole building doth *grow unto an holy temple*, it is included that every part of this temple should be a living stone: for growth (such growth as the apostle speaks of) is an effect of life. Things inanimate, or without life, as material buildings, stones of the quarry, or any heap or congest, may become greater by addition of matter unto them; they cannot
353 grow unto greatness, as wanting the faculty of vegetation or nutrition. That only is capable of growth which is capable of nutrition, and nothing is capable of nutrition but that which is endowed with life. Hence saith St. Peter, 1 Ep. ch. ii. 2, &c.: *As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby: if so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious.* The growth then of every Christian is more than the growth of vegetables; for it

includeth the sense of taste; we must taste the graciousness of the Lord by faith, and we must come unto him by faith, *as unto a living stone, disallowed of men, but chosen of God, and precious;* and coming thus unto him, as the apostle adds, ver. 5, *we also become lively stones, and are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.* St. Peter's inference in that place, vv. 6, 7, &c., is the very same with our apostle St. Paul's, Ephes. ii. 20, and so is the use or application of it the very same with that which our apostle makes in the latter end of this Epistle. But of the use hereafter.

It will in the mean time be very useful for us to observe, 'That neither St. Paul nor St. Peter, when they purposely handled the building of the Gentiles upon this chief corner stone, do mention or intimate any other foundation on which we are to be builded before we be builded on Christ: neither of them taught us to rely on themselves, or on their personal faith, or their successors' authority, as upon secondary foundations, by union with whom (or relying upon whom) we might be grounded upon the prime foundation, which is Christ.' If this they had taught us, they had taught us not to believe as they believed; and not believing as they believed, we could not possibly become such live stones of this spiritual edifice as they were.

5. But if we must believe as St. Peter believed, must we not believe as the church believes? Yes; all that hope to be saved must believe as the true church believes; and they only are the true church which believe as St. Peter believed. The question is, who they be that believe as St. Peter believed? These (we say) are the members of reformed churches, or the reformed churches

themselves. No member of the Romish church can possibly believe as St. Peter did, unless they will abandon the absolute infallibility of the visible Romish church. For every one which believes as St. Peter did, must have the same object of faith which St. Peter had[i]. He may not believe any article of faith which St. Peter did not believe; he may not seek, he cannot hope to be built on the same foundation on which Peter was built, by relying upon any authority upon which Peter himself did not rely. The manner of his union unto this foundation must be the same that Peter's was, as immediate as Peter's union was. What then was the proper object of Peter's faith? What was the fundamental rock on which Peter was by this faith immediately built? That was only Christ the Son of man, and the Son of the living God: and the branches which naturally issue out of this root (or living rock) are, 'That Christ the Son of the living God, the Son of God the Father, was conceived by the Holy Ghost, was born of the Virgin Mary, did suffer under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried,' &c. Did St. Peter believe all or any of these articles by believing his own authority? Was he founded on Christ by the intermediation or interposition of any other secondary foundation? Was he the foundation or rock on which himself was built? If we cannot believe these articles but by believing St. Peter or his personal faith to be the rock on which the church is
354 built, then Peter or his personal faith must be to us as a second foundation. We cannot be united to Christ, we cannot be builded on Christ, unless we be first united unto and builded on Peter. But Peter was not builded upon himself, or upon his own faith;

[i] See book 3. chap. 7, 8. [vol. ii. pp. 235, 249,] a discourse about, *Thou art Peter*, &c.

wherefore, if we be builded upon Peter, or upon Peter's faith, we have not the same object of faith nor the same faith which Peter had; for neither Peter's person nor his faith were any part of the object of his faith. His authority was no means of his union with Christ.

6. That the object of faith must be formally the very same in all true believers, the present Romish church (if this were the question between her and us) could not deny. Her greatest clerks do expressly teach and maintain it as a principle of true divinity. And maintaining this truth, they must confess (unless they will contradict themselves) that we must be as immediately united to Christ by faith as Peter was, we must be as immediately builded on Christ by this faith as Peter was; we must not be built on him, by being built upon Peter's faith, or upon his successors' infallible authority. For so we should have another object or article of faith than Peter had, or his successors have: we should have another foundation than Peter had, as many more foundations as Peter hath successors. Our union with them should be a part of our union with Christ; our belief of their infallible authority should be the chief bond of this union, such a bond or stay of our edification upon Christ, as the stones or cement in a material building is, between the lowest foundation and the intermediate rows of stone which are laid one upon another until the highest row be finished. And to be thus united unto Christ were to make him no living stone, which diffuseth life unto all that are built upon him, but a dead stone, or a stone only able to support the material or dead weight which is laid upon it; there should be no growth in faith, but an addition or cementing of one part unto another, until the edifice were finished. Whereas our

apostle's words are express, that *all the building is fitly framed together in Christ, and so framed groweth up unto an holy temple in the Lord.* He saith not, we are builded one upon another, but *builded together* in him *for an habitation of God through the Spirit.* The Spirit by which we are builded together in Christ, or through which we become the habitation of God, is not communicated and propagated unto us from St. Peter and his successors, as from intermediate foundations or roots. We and all true believers receive the influence of the Spirit as immediately from Christ, or from God the Father and the Son, in the same manner as St. Peter did, though not in the same measure. But the difference of the measure in which we receive it, or the difference of our growth in Christ, doth not argue a different manner, either of our receiving it, or of growth by it.

7. But is this the worst practice of the Romish church, that she adds one article more unto our Creed than St. Peter knew, or taught others to believe; or that she makes Peter's successors to have a foundation which he had not? If thus she did, and no more, this were enough to convince her of gross heresy. But this one article of faith, or this second foundation of faith, which she pretends, is of such a transcendent nature, that it devours all the rest; and doth, if not overthrow the first foundation of our faith, yet, which is all one, it draws us from it. For as many successions as there be of popes, or of Peter's pretended successors, so many several foundations there be of their faith which successively adhere unto them. Nor are these several or successive foundations either immediately cemented or
355 firmly united to the first foundation, which is Christ, or one to another: they are as so many rows or piles of stone laid one upon another, without any juncture or

binding than loose sand. And all that absolutely unite themselves to the present Romish church, that is, to Peter's pretended successors, must of necessity fall off from the first foundation, Christ God and man, and float with these secondary foundations, to wit, Peter's successors, when the floods of temptations do arise.

The point then to be proved is this, That the present Romish church, to wit, the present pope, or such as rely upon him, as a second or intermediate foundation in this structure, cannot possibly be built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, they cannot grow up together as living stones firmly united in Christ Jesus, as in the corner stone. Now the proof of this point is clear, because none can be built upon the foundation of the prophets and the apostles, unless they absolutely believe as they believed, and firmly acknowledge that which they have commended unto us in their writings to have been delivered unto them by God himself; for so they expressly teach us to believe. Believing then as they believed, we must believe, that albeit the apostles and prophets be not the foundation here meant in the text, yet that they were masterbuilders appointed by God for squaring and fitting all that lived with them, or that succeeded them, for this foundation; and that the rule by which, as well the pastors and teachers, as the people taught by them, must be fitted and squared for this foundation, is the doctrine of faith contained in their writings. Both these parts of truth, to wit, that the books of the Old and New Testament are their writings or dictates, and that in these writings the doctrine or rule of faith is contained, must be absolutely believed, and taken for unquestionable, before any modern pastors in the church can be framed or fashioned to be true stones in this building. But no man, which absolutely

believes the present Romish church, can have any absolute belief that the Old and New Testament, or the writings of the apostles and prophets, are infallibly true, or contain the word of God: the best belief that any Romanist can have is but conditional; and the condition is this—'If the present Romish church (to wit, the pope, and such as rely upon his authority) be absolutely infallible, and cannot err in matter of faith.'

But it will be replied: Inasmuch as the Roman catholics take it as a principle most unquestionable, that their church cannot err, they for this reason must believe the doctrine of the apostles and prophets concerning Christ to be infallible, and the books of the Old and New Testament to contain the word of God, because the church their mother, which they firmly believe cannot err, doth tell them so; or, as their own writers speak, because the church their mother doth canonize these books for the books of God. This indeed is the chief advantage which they presume their lay-people have of ours, in that they believe the church's testimony concerning the books of God to be infallible; and if they believe the church to be in this point infallible, they cannot doubt but that these books are the word of God.

But if we look more narrowly into this *mystery of iniquity*, and take their full meaning with us, it will further appear, that this absolute belief of this present church's absolute infallibility doth overthrow or undermine the whole frame of faith. For they extend this supposed infallibility of the Romish church so far, and make the belief of it so necessary, that without this fundamental principle (as they say) we cannot infallibly believe or know the books of the Old and New
356 Testament to contain in them the word of God. And in avouching this, it is evident that they leave both the

authority of the apostolical and prophetical writings, and the authority of the present church, altogether uncertain; so uncertain, that nothing avouched by either of them can be (by their doctrine) so certain as to become any foundation of their faith. If we cannot infallibly believe the books of the Old and New Testament to be the books of God himself, and of divine authority, otherwise than by believing the present Romish church to be infallible, let them tell us how they can possibly believe or prove that the Romish church, or any other congregation of men, hath any such infallible authority. This authority must be either believed or known by light of nature, or by divine testimony or revelation. That the infallibility of their church can be known by light of nature, they do not, they dare not say. For that Peter, on whom that church (as they pretend) is founded, was an apostle of Christ, cannot be known by light of nature, or by sense; it cannot be infallibly believed, but by divine authority, revelation, or testimony. By what divine testimony then do they know that Peter was an apostle, or that the church was to be builded on him or on his successors? You know they pretend that place of St. Matthew, chap. xvi. 18; *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church:* and that of St. Luke, chap. xxii. 32; *I have prayed for thee, that thy faith shall not fail:* and yet they deny that we can possibly know these words to be the words of God, or to have any such meaning as they make of them, unless we will believe the church's authority in avouching them to be the words of God, and her interpretation of them to be infallible.

But leaving them wandering in this round or circle, as we found them long ago[k], let us further consider the

[k] Book 2. ch. 30. [vol. ii. p. 106.] Valentian's enchanted circle.

manner how we are built upon Christ the chief corner stone, and how we must grow unto an holy temple in the Lord.

9. Christ (as you heard before) is not the corner stone or foundation only, but the temple of God; a greater and more spacious temple than all the building which is erected upon him, which groweth up in him. We must be *living stones*, we must be *pillars* in the house of God, we must be *temples of God;* that is, *an habitation of God through the Spirit;* but no *foundations*, no *chief corner stones;* these are Christ's prerogatives: *Behold I have graven thee* (to wit, the spiritual Zion, saith the prophet, Isaiah xlix. 16.) *upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me:* that is, as a late interpreter of the Romish church saith[1], "I have pitched thy foundations in my hands by the wounds which I received in them." By whose diduction, or rent, a place was opened for this future edifice to be erected in him. And for this cause Christ (who is the rock) was every way digged into, in his side, in his hands, in his feet. The mystery whereof is, that he might exhibit a firm foundation out of which the fabric of the church should grow. That we then become living stones in this edifice, it is from our immediate union with this chief corner stone; being united to him, he is fashioned in us; and by him fashioned in us we become living stones, growing stones: we grow from living stones to living pillars, from living pillars to living temples, or habitations for our God. That the children of God are not only living stones, but from living stones grow into pillars, our Saviour himself hath taught us by St. John, Rev. iii. 12: *Him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the*

[1] Anton. Fernand.

temple of my God, and he shall go no more out: and if we be pillars in the temple of God, we must be as immediately placed on the foundation or chief corner stone as St. Peter or Christ's other apostles were: we must 357
be as entire temples as they were. And for this reason our Saviour adds, *upon every one whom he makes a pillar, the name of God, and the name of the city of God, the new Jerusalem, which cometh out of heaven. Know ye not,* saith St. Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 19, *that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost?* As we say, the king's presence makes the court, so it is God's holy Spirit's extraordinary presence in man which makes him his temple. And the reason why Christ is called the temple of God, is because the Godhead dwelleth in him bodily. And for the like reason, every one in whom Christ dwelleth by faith, is, in a participated sense, called the temple of God. And as visible cities consist of several houses, and as the beauty of every city consists in the uniformity of houses, well built and joined together, so the heavenly Jerusalem consists of several temples, whose beauty or uniformity consists in this, that Christ Jesus is the life and light of every several temple, and that his Spirit is uniformly diffused through all.

10. Christ (as you have read before) communicates his titles unto his saints, but not the real prerogative of his titles. He is the Rock; so was Peter a rock, so are we rocks, but not the Rock on which the church is built. He is the chief corner stone, we are living stones; he is the Temple and the Priest of the most high God; and he makes us both temples and priests unto his God. So saith St. Peter, 1 Epist. chap. ii. 5: *Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.*

The model of this spiritual temple and priesthood (that is, of the new Jerusalem, and the service of God performed in it) was exhibited by Moses, Exod. xxiv. 4, 5, at the making of the first covenant. *Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt offerings, and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen unto the Lord.* Immediately after this, *Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness.* vv. 9, 10. The young men which he sent to offer sacrifices (as the best interpreters observe) were the firstborn of their families. For till that time, and at that time, which was before the consecration of Aaron and his sons, it was lawful for the firstborn male of every family to execute the office of the priest; this was his duty. So that every family was as a little parish church, and had his priest to perform this service of God. Now, though all that are built upon the foundation of the prophets and apostles are not admitted to be architects or masterbuilders, though all be not public teachers or pastors, yet all that are or hope to be parts of this building have the same prerogative which the firstborn males of Israel had before Aaron was consecrated; all must be priests, to offer up spiritual sacrifices unto God. But seeing we must grow unto an holy temple, and growth (as was said before) supposeth nutrition, let us now see what is the nourishment by which we must grow from living stones to be living pillars, from pillars to be living temples, yea kings and priests unto our God.

11. The nature and quality of the nutriment by

which we must grow cannot in fewer words be more pithily expressed than it is by St. Peter, 1 Epist. chap. ii. 2: it is *the sincere milk of the word.* But how good soever the nutriment be, it doth not kindly nourish, unless we have an appetite to it; therefore 358
the same apostle adds, ἐπιποθήσατε, *desire*, or *long after, the sincere milk of the word.* We must then desire to have *the word* dwell in us plentifully, and we must desire to have it *sincere*, that is, pure and unmingled. Now this milk may become unsincere or mingled, sometimes by the default of the pastor or teacher, sometimes by the default of the hearers. The duty which concerns us teachers is, that we do not mingle the word with the traditions of men, how ancient soever they be. This is the fault of the Romish church, which the church our mother hath sufficiently prevented by public edicts or decrees. But many, otherwise averse enough from traditions of the Romish or other ancient church, ofttimes corrupt it with their own conceits or fancies, which will easily mingle themselves with the word, unless we speak out of premeditation, and have both art and leisure to revise and examine, as well our own meditations, as the meditations or expositions of others, whose help we use. Since the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit did cease, there is no faculty under the sun which more requires the help of art and study, than the exposition of scripture doth. It requires a greater skill than the skill of alchymy, to extract the true sense and meaning of the Holy Ghost from the plausible glosses or expositions which are daily made upon them. But how sincerely soever the word may be delivered by the pastor, it may be corrupted by the hearer. Milk (as physicians tell us) is turned into purer blood with greater facility than any other nutriment, so the body which receives it be free

from humours; but if the stomach or other vital parts be stuffed with phlegm, oppressed with choler, or other corruption, there is no nutriment which is more easily corrupted, or more apt to feed bad humours than milk, how pure soever it be. Thus, though *the sincere milk of the word* be not only the best, but the only nutriment of souls, by which we must grow up in faith, yet if the heart which receives it from the preacher's mouth sincere be pestered with corrupt affections, it doth not nourish; if it do not purge or purify the corrupt humours, but mingle with them, they malignify one another. The special humours which on the hearer's part corrupt the sincere milk of the word, and of which every one that will be a diligent hearer must endeavour to purge his soul by repentance, are set down by St. Peter, 1 Epist. chap. ii. 1, 2: *Wherefore laying aside all malice, and all guile, and hypocrisies, and envies, and all evil speakings, as newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word.* We must first, then, desire the word as physic, to purge our souls—that part of the word, I mean, which teacheth repentance and denial of all ungodliness—before we can hope to grow by the milk of it, that is, by the comfort of God's promises. Unless our hearts be in good measure purified by obedience to the general precepts, or moral duties, how sincere soever the milk of the word preached be, our desire of it cannot be sincere; we shall desire it, or delight in it, to maintain faction or secret pride, not to grow up thereby in sincerity of mind and humbleness of spirit, which are the most proper effects of *the milk of the word* sincerely delivered and sincerely received.

SECTION II. 359

Of Christ's Lordship or Dominion.

PHILIPPIANS II. 11.

That every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is LORD, *to the glory of God the Father.*

ACTS II. 36.

Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.

REVELATIONS V. 13.

Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.

The degrees or steps by which we must ascend before we enter this beautiful gate of the Lord's house, are three:

First, What it is to be *a lord*.

Second, Upon what grounds, or in what respects, Christ is, by peculiar title, called THE LORD.

Third, How our confession or acknowledgment of Christ to be THE LORD doth redound to the glory of God the Father

CHAP. VI.

What it is to be a Lord. *Though there be many called* Lords, *yet is there but* one absolute Lord.

1. THE title of *lord*, whether we take it in the Greek, in the Latin, or in our English, is sometimes a title only of respect or courtesy: so strangers usually salute men of place or note by the name of *dominus*, or sometimes of *domination* itself. And we usually

instyle the eldest sons of earls by the title of *lords;* and all the sons of dukes, even from their cradles, are so instyled. Not to vouchsafe them this title, when we mention them, were ill manners or discourtesy. Howbeit even they which are bound to love them best, the very parents of their bodies, do not permit them to enjoy the realities answering to these honourable titles before their full age, and for the most part till they themselves have surrendered them by death. The reality answering to this title of *lord* is *dominion.* Every one that hath dominion is a lord in respect of that over which he hath dominion; and whosoever really is *a lord* is so instyled from some dominion which he exerciseth. *Dominus* in Latin sometimes goes for no more than our English word *owner:* and this is the lowest or meanest signification of the word *lord.* The full extent or highest value of the word *dominus,* or *lord,* must be gathered from the several degrees or scale of dominion; as, either from the extent of the matter or subject over which dominion is exercised, or from the sovereignty of title. *Dominion,* as lawyers define it, is 'a faculty or power fully to dispose of any corporal or bodily substance, so far as they are not restrained by law.' And by how much a man's power to dispose of what he hath is less restrained by law, by so much his dominion over it is the greater; and he in respect of it is, if not so much a greater lord, yet so much more properly a lord. But fitting it is, in regard of public good, or of posterity, that most men's power to dispose of that which otherwise by full right is their own, should be in certain cases restrained. Many are lords of great lands, and may
360 dispose of their annual profits as they please, but yet cannot sell or alienate their perpetual inheritance. Others have a more full power to dispose of the houses

wherein they dwell; a power, not only to let or set them for years, but to sell or give away the perpetual inheritance; who yet are by law restrained utterly to demolish or set them on fire, especially if they be enclosed by neighbour lodgings. The cases are many wherein *dominium sub altiore dominio est.* There is a subordination of lordships or dominions; some are mean lords, some are chief lords. Even meaner lords or owners are not to be denied the titles of *lords*, albeit they cannot alienate the soil whereof they are owners without license of the chief lord; much more are chief or higher lords to be so reputed, because their dominion or power to dispose of their own lands is less subordinate, howbeit in some cases limited by the rule of law. And this restraint, in how few cases soever it be, hinders their greatness from growing into absolute dominion: lords they are, but not absolute lords. This is a title peculiar to *kings* or *monarchs*, who are so called only in respect of their own subjects or of their own lands. No mere mortal man since Adam was lord of the whole earth, or bare sovereignty over all men or bodily substances. And the greatest of men have been subject or inferior to angels.

2. To leave other divisions of dominion to lawyers; all dominion is either *jurisdictionis* or *proprietatis*, a power of jurisdiction, or a right to the property. The former branch of dominion is exercised only over men or reasonable creatures, which only are capable of jurisdiction passive, or of government. The latter branch, which we call *dominion of property*, for the most part respects things corporal. Howbeit, even men or reasonable creatures are sometimes subject to both branches of dominion, but in different measure, according to the several rites or customs of divers ages, nations, or people. Such as the Latins call *servi* or

servuli—slaves (or *servants* properly so called), were *in bonis domini;* they were the goods or possession of their masters[1]. These bodily lords had not only dominion of jurisdiction over, but dominion of property to their persons. No law did restrain their masters from disposing of these servants as they pleased; as either to exchange, give away, or sell them and their children. The poor servants did oftentimes *mutare dominum, non servitutem,* "change their lords, without any exchange or alteration of their slavery." Sometimes the Romans had, and some other nations at this day have, *dominium vitæ et necis,* power or dominion to kill, maim, or wound their servants, without any restraint or control of law. But this absolute power to dispose of their slaves or servants was afterwards by the Roman law inhibited. Lords and masters of private servants were liable to the sentence of public law, if they did use intolerable cruelty or severity towards their slaves. But by the laws of most Christian nations, this absolute dominion of lords over their servants (and consequently this kind of subjection and slavery) is taken away. For every Christian is an Israelite or Hebrew, and somewhat more. All are in reputation the sons of Abraham. Now the positive law of God, before our Saviour's time, did exempt the sons of Abraham by the free woman from slavery. The kings of Judah might not make bondmen of their brethren the sons of Jacob.

3. Albeit we retain the name of *masters* and *servants,* yet neither are the one sort properly called *domini,* nor the other *servi.* A master with us is no more than *paterfamilias* amongst the Latins; and those whom we call *servants* are *famuli.* Every
361 father of a family hath *dominium jurisdictionis,*

[1] See book 8. ch. 7. [vol. vii. p. 430.] and book 10. ch. 15, 16. [vol. ix. p. 83, &c.]

a right or power of jurisdiction over his family, but not *dominium proprietatis*, not right or power of property in their persons. Howbeit, even this power or dominion of jurisdiction is limited, as well by the laws of God as of man. No father of his family may correct any of his family as he pleaseth, but in such cases, and so far as the law will permit: and according to the different condition of the parties, over whom the father of the family hath this power of jurisdiction or correction, must the exercise of it be always tempered: no husband or master of a family may exercise the same power over his wife which he doth over his children. No man by the law of nature ought to use his children as his servants or apprentices, unless they be such by estate or condition of life. Nor can a master of a family which is of a more ingenuous or generous profession, put his servants or apprentices, which are of the same profession, upon such services as a master of some inferior trade or profession may put his servants to. A merchant may not employ an apprentice to that profession in such works and services as are proper to and well befitting a tinker or cobbler, or some other inferior craftsman or day-labourer. Howbeit, every master of an apprentice or hired servant hath a right or power, not only of jurisdiction or of government, but of property, though not over his servant's body or person, yet over his bodily labours or employments. Apprentices or servants, which are as freeborn, and of parentage as good, perhaps better, than their masters, have no power to dispose of their own labours or employments, but must herein follow their master's directions and appointment; and in case they alienate their industry from their master's service, though to their own profit, without his leave, they are subject to his power or jurisdiction; he may authoritatively admonish, chastise, or otherwise require satisfac-

tion for wronging him by misexpense of time, or in that power or interest which he hath by covenant in their labours or employments. Yet may not any master of a family punish a servant as he pleaseth, or as his passion shall suggest, but so far only as the law shall permit: for every master of a private family is under the power or dominion of the public magistrate, and subject, if he be a Christian, to ecclesiastic censure, in case he transgress the manner or measure of the punishment which the law of God or of man doth permit him to exercise only within his family. Nor may any master exact those services or bodily employments of his servants or apprentices at all times, or upon all days, which at some times, or upon most days, he may. If a servant should refuse to labour in his ordinary vocation upon the Lord's day, though commanded so to do by his master, the master hath no lawful power of jurisdiction over him, no power to chastise him for such refusal; because the master's right or power to dispose either of his own or of his servant's employments for that day is inhibited by the law of God and of his church, which hath dominion of jurisdiction in those cases over masters.

4. The issue of these generalities concerning lordship or dominion is this—'Though there be many which are called *lords* and *masters*, (and many there be which really and indeed are such,) yet is there in truth but one absolute Lord, whether we speak of the lordship or dominion of propriety or of jurisdiction, and that is God.' For by right or title of creation he hath more absolute power over all his creatures, than any creature, than absolute *kings* and *monarchs*, (as we call them,) than any chief lord hath over his lands or goods, over any thing which they can call theirs, whether by gift,
362 purchase, or inheritance. For whatsoever by these or any other means is theirs—as money, goods, or any

other bodily substance—they did not make any parcel or matter of the substance of it, but only acquired a right or title to it, being made. As they cannot create or make any thing out of nothing, so can they not utterly destroy or annihilate any thing created or made. The height of all created power is only to amend or mar the fashion of things; and this is but permitted; yea even the permission itself presupposed, this power is still subordinate in the exercise of it, to an higher power. But God doth found his right of dominion over all things, or his power to dispose of them and of their appurtenances, in their very radical being. This is his sole gift. Nor is his power or dominion only more sovereign, or intensively greater, over the most noble bodily substance that is, than any creature can have over the least thing that is; but it extends also unto those substances which are not subject to man, or any creature's dominion. He hath a more sovereign title of dominion over the souls and spirits of kings and monarchs, over the blessed angels under whose guardianship the greatest monarchs are, than they have over their meanest vassals.

So that his dominion extends beyond the definition given by lawyers, which comprehends only things corporal, but meddles not with celestial substances, or spiritual, as angels, which are not subject to the jurisdiction of princes, nor can they be imprisoned in their coffers. Men, as they could not make themselves, so neither can they by their valour, wit, or industry, gain or create a title to any thing which is not God's, and whereof he is not absolute Lord, before and after they come to be lords and owners subordinate of it. They cannot move their bodies nor employ their minds but by his free donation; nor can they enjoy his freest gifts, but by his concourse or cooperation. He hath a

dominion of property over their souls, yea an absolute dominion, not of property only, but of uncontrollable jurisdiction over their very thoughts, as it is implied, Deut. viii. 17, 18. He doth not only give us the substance which we are enabled to get, but gives us the very power, wit, and strength, to get or gather it: not this power only, whereby we gather substance, but our very being, which supports this power, is his gift: and unless our being be supported and strengthened by his power sustentative, we cannot so much as think of gathering wealth or getting necessaries, much less can we dispose of our own endeavours for accomplishing our hopes, desires, or thoughts. To conclude then; all we have, even we ourselves, are God's by absolute dominion, as well of property as of jurisdiction. There is no law in heaven or earth that can inhibit or restrain his absolute power to dispose of all things as he pleaseth; for he works all things by the counsel of his will, and he only is absolute Lord.

But absolute lordship or dominion, how far soever extended, though over angels, powers, and principalities, from this ground or universal title of *creation*, is entirely, jointly, and indivisibly common to the blessed Trinity. For so St. Athanasius teacheth us: "The Father is LORD, the Son is LORD, and the Holy Ghost is LORD," (absolute Lord, as well in respect of dominion as of jurisdiction,) "and yet not three Lords, but one Lord;" and if but one Lord, then the lordship or dominion is one and the same, alike absolute, either for intensive perfection or extension, in the Son as in the Father, in the Holy Ghost as in the Son. Yet is it well observed by a judicious commentator upon St. Paul's Epistles, "That to be *LORD* is the proper title or epitheton (in St. Paul's language) of Christ the Son of God, both God and man, and emphatically ascribed

to him, even in those passages wherein he had occasion 363
expressly to mention the distinction of persons in the Trinity." As where he saith, *The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God*, (he doth not say, *of God the Lord,*) *and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost*, (without addition of this title of *Lord,*) *be with you all.* And so in our Apostles' Creed we profess to "believe in God the Father Almighty," without addition of the title *Lord*, and so "in God the Holy Ghost," not in the Lord the Holy Ghost, but "in Christ our Lord." Which leads to the second point proposed in the entrance to this second section.

CHAP. VII.

In what Respects or upon what Grounds Christ is by peculiar Title called the Lord. *And first, Of the Title itself. Secondly, Of the real Grounds unto this Title.*

1. CONCERNING the name of *Lord*, there is no verbal difference in the Greek or Latin, whether this name or title be attributed to God the Father (as oft it is) or to God the Holy Ghost, unto the blessed Trinity, or unto Christ God and man. Yet in the Hebrew there is a difference in the very names or words. The name *Jehovah*, which is usually rendered Κύριος, *Dominus*, or *Lord*, is alike common to every person in the holy Trinity, as expressing the nature of the Godhead—*he that is being itself;* howbeit, even this name is sometimes in peculiar sort attributed unto Christ. But that Christ, or the Son of God, is in those places personally meant, this must be gathered from the subject, or special circumstances of the matter, not from the name or title itself. But the name *Adonai*, which properly signifies *lord* or *king*, as βασιλεὺς in Greek doth,

(implying as much as the *pillar*, or *foundation of the people*,) is the peculiar title of the Son of God, or of God incarnate. And for attributing this title unto Christ as his peculiar, the apostle St. Paul had a good warrant out of the prophetical writings, especially the Psalms, which he questionless understood a great deal better than many great divines and accurate linguists have done his writings, or the harmony betwixt the psalmists' and his evangelical comments on them. This title of *Lord—Adonai*—is used most frequently in those psalms which contain the most pregnant prophecies of Christ or the Messias' exaltation. Psalm ii. 2, 4: *The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed.* But *he that sitteth in the heavens* (doubtless he means the same Jehovah) *shall laugh.* Yet he doth not say, *Jehovah*, but *Adonai, the Lord shall have them in derision.*

The reality of dominion answering to this title of *Lord*, whereunto the Messias, against whom they conspired, was exalted, is more fully expressed in the same psalm, vv. 8—12: *Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel. Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling. Kiss the Son*, (the Son doubtless of Jehovah,) *lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him.* And so again, psalm xlv, which is as
364 it were the *epithalamium*, or marriage song of Christ and his church: the prophet exhorts the spouse to do, as Christ willed his disciples to do, and as Abraham

had done at God's command—*Forget also thine own people, and thy father's house; so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty: for he is thy Lord; and reverence* or *worship thou him.* vv. 10, 11. And again, psalm cx, wherein Christ's everlasting priesthood is confirmed by oath, it is said, *Jehovah said unto my Lord,* (*Adonai,*) *Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.* But may not the Jew thus object, that seeing our Christ or their expected Messias is instyled *Adonai,* not *Jehovah,* in these very places wherein his exaltation or supreme dominion is foretold, that therefore he is not truly God, as Jehovah is? To this objection, our Saviour's reply to the Jews (which had answered him rightly, that the Messias was to be the Son of David) is unanswerable and most satisfactory. If the expected Messias were not to be the Son of God, and truly God the supreme Lord, as well of the dead as of the living, why did David *in spirit call him Lord,* before he was the Son of David? It is a point to be observed, that the Jews in our Saviour's time did not, or could not deny, that this psalm was literally meant of their expected Messias, albeit the later Jews seek to wrest it, (but most ridiculously,) some to Hezekiah, some to Abraham.

But that the word *Adonai* is of no less value or importance than *Jehovah,* but only imports *Jehovah,* or *God incarnate,* or the Messias' exaltation to be Lord or King, may be evinced against the Jew; for that the same sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, which one psalmist solemnly offers unto *Jehovah,* another psalmist (or perhaps the same) doth alike solemnly offer up to *Adonai,* or to the expected Messias, in another psalm. As psalm lvii. (which is a prophetical song of David, and contains the exaltation of his God and Lord): *Be thou exalted, O God, above the heavens; let thy glory*

be above all the earth. vv. 5. 11. This prophecy was then punctually fulfilled, and David's prayer or request signed by the mouth of God, when our Saviour, after his resurrection, said, *All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. Unto this Jehovah or God, whose exaltation he foresaw and heartily prayed for, and unto whom he had directed his prayers, ver. 1, he offers the sacrifice of praise, ver. 9, under the title of *Adonai: I will praise* or *confess thee, O Lord, among the people: I will sing unto thee among the nations.* The very selfsame sacrifice David offers unto the same God, under the title of *Jehovah*, psalm cviii. 1—5: *O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing and give praise, even with my glory. Awake, psaltery and harp: I myself will awake early. I will praise thee, O Lord, among the people: and I will sing praises unto thee among the nations. For thy mercy is great above the heavens: and thy truth reacheth unto the clouds. Be thou exalted, O God, above the heavens: and thy glory above all the earth:* which last words were twice repeated in the fifty-seventh psalm.

Two fundamental points collected, by collating scripture with scripture.

2. These fundamental points of faith are clear from this collation of scripture: first, That *Adonai*, or *Lord*, was the known title of the Messias, whom the Jews expected in our Saviour's time; and this was the reason that the Pharisees had not a word to answer or rejoin unto our Saviour, when he avouched that the Messias was to be the Son of God, because *David in spirit called him* (*Adonai*) *Lord.* Matt. xxii. 45. The second, That he that was *Adonai*, or the Messias, was likewise *Jehovah*, truly God, because David did not in spirit only call him *Lord*, but did in spirit worship him

as his Lord and God, with the best sacrifice that he could devise, as appears from psalm lvii. 8.

A great part of the book of Psalms, even all those 365
passages (if my observation fail me not) without exception, which mention the extraordinary manifestation of God's glory, or his exaltation as King, run the same way, and as it were pay tribute unto the infinite ocean of God's mercy, first manifested in our Saviour's exaltation to the right hand of God. The more remarkable passages are these, psalm xcvii. 1: *Jehovah reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof.* Whilst Jehovah was only known in Jury, the multitude of the isles or nations had no special reason to be glad, for *Judah was then his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion;* but after God had given our Saviour Christ *the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession;* that is, after our Saviour's ascension into heaven, and the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon his disciples, enabling them to preach the gospel of the kingdom unto all nations, *the multitude of the isles*, the whole earth, had reason to rejoice: then was that fulfilled which followeth in that psalm, ver. 6: *The heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory.* That this psalm is literally meant of Christ's exaltation to be Lord of lords, and of his inauguration to his everlasting kingdom, the apostle St. Paul, Heb. i. 6, puts out of question amongst all Christians: *When he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world, he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him;* so the psalmist had said in this ps. xcvii. ver. 7: *Confounded be all they that serve graven images: worship him, all ye gods;* or as the Septuagint (upon which our apostle often paraphrased), *Worship him, all ye angels of God.* The matter or subject of this psalm is almost the same with psalm ii. Both

The exaltation of Jehovah as King, is that *kingdom of heaven* which St. John Baptist preached to be then approaching.

of them contain prophecies concerning the declaration of Christ to be the Son of God. And from this harmony between this ninety-seventh and the second psalm, and from the common prenotion or rule of interpreting scriptures, known to the learned or unpartially observant in those days, the apostle adds that preface unto his testimony, *when he bringeth in the firstbegotten into the world:* he supposeth that the learned among his countrymen should or might have known that both these prophecies were to be punctually fulfilled upon the exaltation of the Messias, or of those times wherein God should be manifested in the flesh.

The Septuagint, Deut. xxxii. 43, reconciled with psalm xcvii. 7.

3. Yet some conjecture that our apostle, Heb. i. 6, hath reference rather to Deut. xxxii. 43, in the Greek translation, than unto psalm xcvii. in the Hebrew. The words indeed in the Greek or Septuagint are the very same, though in the Hebrew not the same by any equivalency of the literal sense. *At nec sic quidem male.* There is a variety of sense, yet no discord, but rather a full and perfect consort between the literal and grammatical sense of the Hebrew, and the mystical and real sense which the Greek or Septuagint in both places expresseth. First, the ninety-seventh psalm (as many others are) is a poetical descant upon Moses' divine prophetical song, Deut. xxxii. And the seventy interpreters (whether out of some prenotion, or out of the admirable concord between that song of Moses and psalm xcvii, or out of a divine instinct, wherewith (as St. Augustine is of opinion) they were impelled sometimes to intersert a more express meaning of the Holy Ghost, than an ordinary commentator could out of the Hebrew have observed ; whether this way or that way moved, they) have given the same paraphrase upon Deut. xxxii. 43. which our apostle hath made upon psalm xcvii. 7, which is

no other than the Septuagint had made before, but literally more consonant to the Hebrew, than their paraphrase upon Deut. xxxii. is.

But more probable it is, that our apostle did aim at ps. xcvii, than at the forecited place of Deuteronomy, 366 because the other testimonies following in that Heb. i. 8, 9, are evidently taken out of the book of Psalms: *Unto the* SON *he saith, Thy throne, O* GOD, *is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* This testimony is evident in psalm xlv. 6, 7. So is that other, Heb. i. 10—12, expressly contained in psalm cii: *Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish; but thou remainest; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail.*

The former testimony is perhaps typically prophetical, and may in some sort concern Solomon according to the literal sense, but Solomon only as he was a type of that Son of David, who was likewise to be the Son of God. But the character almost of every line in the hundred and second psalm testifies that the psalmist in this grievous complaint had more than a typical representation, such a distinct and clear vision of Christ's glory and exaltation as the prophet Isaiah, chap. liii. had of his humiliation in our flesh or human nature. The title of this psalm is, "A prayer of the afflicted, when he shall be in distress, and pour forth his meditations before the Lord." And, "the only fountain of comfort, to all afflicted in body or soul, is the exaltation

of Christ the Son of God in our flesh or nature[n]." That which must sweeten all our bodily sorrows or afflictions, even the bitterness of death itself, whereof this psalmist, and the people of God in his time, had tasted, must be our meditation upon that and the like speeches of our apostle: *If we suffer with Christ, we shall also reign with him.* And for your comfort in all distress, I cannot commend any fitter matter of meditation to you, than is contained in this hundred and second psalm, and in the second, fourth, and twelfth chapters to the Hebrews. This exaltation of Christ to be Lord is alike clearly foreprophesied, psalm xcix. and psalm cxlv. as every observant reader may of himself collect.

The grounds of Christ's title to be Lord.

4. The more extraordinary and more special grounds or bases whereupon this title of *Lord*, as it is peculiar to Christ, is erected, are these: First, Christ is in peculiar sort called *the* LORD, because it was God the Son, not God the Father, or God the Holy Ghost, who did personally pay the ransom of our sins; and this he fully paid by offering up part of our nature, made his own, in a bloody sacrifice to the Father. Servants we were by creation of our nature, not only to God the Son, but to God the Father and to God the Holy Ghost, to the divine nature or blessed Trinity: but we had sold ourselves, for enjoying the pleasures of the flesh, unto God's adversary: and albeit we could not by any compact or covenant, whether implicit or express, made with Satan by our first parents, or by ourselves, alienate ourselves from God's dominion of jurisdiction over us; yet we did renounce his service, and that interest which we had in his gracious protection as he was our Lord, and alienate unto his enemy that property or disposal of our employments, which by right of creation entirely belonged to God. God, after our

[n] See ch. 2. §. 5. and ch. 3. §. 11. [pp. 27. and 36. of this volume.]

first parents' fall, was no otherwise our Lord than any king is lord over rebels, traitors, murderers, or of others who by their misdemeanours may alienate their allegiance from him, and exempt themselves from his gracious protection, but not from his power or dominion of jurisdiction, for *he is the minister of God, for executing vengeance* upon such. Our first parents had 367
declared themselves to be traitors, and we had continued a race of rebels against our God and Creator, without all hope of being restored unto God's favour and service, unless satisfaction were made for our transgression, and means purchased for establishing us in a better estate, than the estate of servants, which we had by the gift of creation. Now, not only our redemption from the estate of slavery unto Satan, but all the means for our further advancement, (after our ransom was paid,) were purchased by the Son of God: and that which most advanceth the peculiar title of Christ's dominion and lordship over us was the price which he gave for us: for *we were not redeemed with corruptible things, as with silver and gold,* (though men with these, and things more corruptible than these, do purchase the real title of *lords*, and exercise the dominion of lords over lands or servants so purchased,) *but we were redeemed by the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.* 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. Blood is the most precious and dearest part of man's body, and greater love we cannot testify unto our dearest friends, than by spending our blood for them. Losses we value none so deeply as forgetfulness, ungrateful neglects, or contempt from them for whose sakes and credit we have been content (specially out of sincerity of love and sober resolution) to shed our blood. Never was any blood either so copiously shed, or out of the like sincerity of love, or sobriety of reso-

lution, as Christ's blood was shed for all and every one of us: this blood did immediately issue from his manhood, whereof it was a true and lively part; yet was it the blood, not of man only, but of God: whence if we consider either our own miserable estate, being then the enemies of God, or his dignity that made atonement for us; what real portion, branch, or degree of service can we imagine answerable to this sovereign title of *Lord*, which Christ hath not more than fully purchased over all that are partakers of flesh and blood?

Other grounds of Christ's title to be *the Lord.*

5. Yet, besides this ground or title of Christ's peculiar lordship or dominion over us, there is another, more forcible to command our most cheerful service, unless our hope be quite dead, or the affection of love utterly extinguished in us: for Christ by his precious blood did not only purchase our freedom from the slavery of Satan, but being set free, doth by the everlasting efficacy of this blood once shed, both wash and nourish us, not as his servants, but as the sons of his and our heavenly Father. Sin and slavery was the *terminus a quo*, the condition or state from which he redeemed us; but the end of our redemption from these was to invest us in the liberty of the sons of God. The height of all our hopes in the life to come, is, to be kings and priests as he is; but in the mean time we are or may be live members of his glorious body; and being such, he hath a more peculiar right of dominion over us, over all that pertain unto his church, than by right of creation he hath as God, than by right of redemption or atonement he hath as God and man: for that part of our nature, that flesh and blood, which he took of his mother, was his by a more peculiar title and real property, than it was God the Father's or the Holy Ghost's; and we by mystical and spiritual union with that part of the human nature which he assumed into the unity of his

divine person, are his, at least he by this union is our Head and Lord, by a more strict and proper title, than God the Father or God the Holy Ghost is: by the former title of redemption or satisfaction made for us, he is our Lord, and we his servants: by this title of mystical union with him, he is the Bridegroom or Head, the church is his spouse; and being Head of the church, every member of it is bound (as God by the 368
psalmist exhorts the spouse, psalm xlv.) *to worship him as our Lord and God;* for the husband is lord of the wife. He bought all our souls, being in the state of aliens or bond-servants, and after cleansed and purified them, that they might be espoused to him, and finally presented to his Father: *He hath purchased the church of God* (saith St. Paul) *with his own blood*, Acts xx. 28: and again, Eph. v.; *Christ gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church*, &c. vv. 25—27.

CHAP. VIII.

What our Confession of Christ to be the Lord importeth, and how it redounds to the Glory of God the Father.

1. *Every tongue*[o] *must confess that Jesus Christ is Lord*, our Lord, by a peculiar real title. To this confession every son of Adam, to whom God hath given the use of the tongue, is bound *de jure;* but many sons of Adam, to whom God hath given the use of the tongue, do not confess so much *de facto:* the Jews with their tongues flatly deny him to be the Lord, or their promised Messias; the Turks and Mahometans confess him to be a Lord of Christians, but deny him to be *the Lord*, the chief Lord under God the Father; this title of *chief lord* they ascribe to Mahomet, and

[o] Rev. v. 13.

under his right they pretend a title of dominion over Christendom. The heathens, which know not God, do not so much as question whether he be a lord, or whether he or Mahomet be, under God, the chief lord. But as for us Christians, we all, to whom God hath given the use of the tongue, do confess him to be *the Lord:* as for those, to whom the use of the tongue is by the course of nature and God's ordinary providence denied, others for them do engage themselves at sacred baptism, that they, when God shall grant them a heart to understand and a tongue to speak, shall confess him to be the Lord, and to be unto them their Lord. And in case they die before they come to possess the use of their hearts or of their tongues, the church or parish wherein this profession of faith was made on their behalfs are bound to profess thus much for them. And as God (no doubt) accepts the prayers of the church, wherein they are baptized, for them which cannot so much as speak to men, much less pray to God or to Christ, "that they may be admitted into his visible church, and be reputed as members of his mystical body;" so doubtless he will accept the prayers of the church, and of every faithful member of the church wherein they live and die, that they may be accepted into the church triumphant, and to us invisible; albeit they never attained unto the use of the tongue, or whenas the Lord, which gave others this blessing, hath taken it from them: for even of the tongue, or of the use of the tongue, that of Job is most true, and to be resumed by all, as well by the dying as by the living; by him for his own part, and by the living on his behalf—*The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.* Job i. 21.

2. Thus every tongue is bound *de jure* to confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord, that Lord whom Job

so long before did confess. But though every tongue of men throughout the world, every tongue of Christians, of Jews, of Mahometans or infidels, should from 369
their birth confess thus much; would this be enough for that acknowledgment which here is required, that *Jesus Christ is the Lord?* or would such acknowledgment of every tongue be sufficient to pay that tribute which is due *unto the glory of God the Father*, from this confession which is here required, that *Jesus Christ is the Lord?* No; it is not the confession of every tongue that will suffice, albeit the acknowledgment or confession of every tongue be *de jure* required. In this speech, *Every tongue must confess*, &c. there is a twofold universality included: the one, of the parties thus confessing or acknowledging; the other, of the duties or services to be performed by every party thus acknowledging Christ to be the Lord.

An universality of duties as well as of tongues is included in this confession.

To begin with the former: when the apostle saith, *That every tongue must confess, that Jesus Christ is* THE LORD, you must take this universal note to be equivalent to that phrase so often used (in the book of the Revelation) by the evangelist and apostle: *All nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues*—every one, of all sorts, of the sons of Adam—are bound *de jure* to confess, 'That Jesus Christ, the Son of God and the Son of man, conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the virgin Mary, is THE LORD of the dying and of the living, of the quick and of the dead.' As for all such as do not either in heart or tongue, or in both, either by themselves or by others for them, truly acknowledge him in this life to be such a Lord, they shall acknowledge him to be such a Lord after their resurrection from death, of which likewise he is Lord.

3. But the acknowledgment of every tongue, or of every one to whom God hath vouchsafed either a

tongue or the use of the tongue, will not suffice to find him a gracious Lord at the resurrection from the dead, and at the day of final judgment. There must be (as is said) an universality as well of duties and services to be performed by every particular person to whom God hath given an heart to understand, as an universality of tongues or lips which are to make this confession. The real language of every heart will be sufficient for every one in particular whom God hath deprived or denied the use of the tongue. But unto him to whom God hath given an understanding heart, and the use of the tongue also, the hearty prayers and gracious words of others in his behalf will not suffice, unless God by their prayers do frame his heart to believe, and move his tongue (if God have given him the use of the tongue) *to confess, that Jesus Christ is the Lord. Corde creditur ad justitiam, ore fit confessio ad salutem. If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* Rom. x. 9, 10.

The universality or extent of this belief or confession, in respect of the parties whom it concerns, is most fully expressed in the verse following. For the scripture saith, Isaiah xxviii. 16, *Whosoever believeth on him shall* (*not make haste*, or) *not be ashamed.* And again, Joel ii. 32, *Whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord* (whether he be Jew or Gentile) *shall be saved.* Thus you see, that there is an universality of the parties or persons which are bound *de jure* to make this confession, and an universality of comfortable promises unto all such as make it as they ought; that is, not in tongue only, but with the heart; not in heart

only, if God have given them the use of the heart and of the tongue, or his blessings of memory and understanding.

4. That (besides this universality of persons confess- 370
ing Christ with their tongues to be the Lord) there is an universality or totality of duties to be performed by every one that confesseth Christ to be the Lord, is evident from Jesus Christ our Lord's own mouth, Luke vi. 46: *Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?* This speech infers thus much at least, 'That though all other, both Jews and Gentiles, even every tongue throughout the world, had confessed as much as these his present disciples (of which some were temporary, some perpetual professors) did; yet this would not suffice to make them capable of the reward universally promised to his true disciples and servants; that this confession, though made by every tongue besides, was not sufficient to make any particular man capable of the reward (promised to all his true servants that are capable of his words and sayings) which was not ready and willing to do them.' That every one which heard his sayings, and was willing to do them, was truly capable of all the blessings which he promised, is clear from his words following, vv. 47—49: *Whosoever cometh to me, and heareth my sayings, and doeth them, I will shew you to whom he is like: he is like a man which built an house, and digged deep, and laid the foundation on a rock: and when the flood arose, the stream beat vehemently upon that house, and could not shake it: for it was founded upon a rock. But he that heareth, and doeth not, is like a man that without a foundation built an house upon the earth; against which the stream did beat vehemently, and immediately it fell; and the ruin of that house was great.* But our Lord and Saviour's

mind is by himself more fully expressed to this purpose, Matt. vii. 21: *Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.* The limitation of these words, as well for their negative as affirmative extent, is this: that neither every one, nor any one of them, which shall confess only with their tongues that he is the Lord, *shall enter into the kingdom of heaven.* This limitation of the negative, or rather our assurance of faith that this negative is thus far to be extended, is manifest from the verse following: for to prophesy in the name of Christ, is more than to confess with the tongue only that Christ is Lord; to cast out devils in the name of Christ, is more than to prophesy in his name; to do many works of wonder in Christ's name, is more than to cast out devils in his name. For to cast out devils indeed is a wonderful work, and yet but one of those wonderful works which then and for many years after were done in Christ's name, by such as (although they did call Christ *Lord, Lord,* as he truly is the Lord of all) were not Christ's true servants, not such as Christ will take notice of or approve as better, but rather reject as worse than infidels, in that last and dreadful day, when he shall call his servants (whether *de jure* or *de facto*) to a final account. For so it is expressed in the words following, vv. 22, 23: *Many will say to me in that day,* (and the more the better, so their plea were good,) *Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you;* that is, 'I never approved of you, but rather disapproved you and your works, as worse than the works of heathens, or heathenish workers.' For unto the heathens, as

heathens, he hath not said that he will say in the last day, *Depart from me, ye workers of iniquity.* That the affirmative extent of his words, to such as shall not only with their tongues confess, but in heart and practice acknowledge him to be the Lord, is as large and ample as his former threatenings to such as either in 371
deed and facts deny him, or with their tongues and lips do not confess him to be the Lord, his promise in the next words, ver. 24, will give us full assurance. *Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock.* And thus, you see, the words of our Lord and Saviour (confirmed by the mouths of two authentic witnesses, St. Matthew and St. Luke) do warrant the truth of these two universals, 'That never a one of such as only with the tongue confess him to be the Lord shall enter into the kingdom of heaven: that every one which in heart confesseth him, though with tongue he cannot confess him to be the Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven:' for every one which doth the will of his Father which is in heaven, (and the doing of this his heavenly Father's will here is not an act of the tongue, but of the heart and of the affections,) shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, which is the place and seat appointed for all Christ's true servants, and only for them. The only question then remaining is, What this will of his heavenly Father is? what it is to do it?

5. This will of his heavenly Father is either general, whatsoever is expressed in the ten commandments, in the moral law, or in the prophets; or more special, as it is revealed in Christ or by Christ. Did Christ then give us a new law, or other precepts, than God by Moses had done? or did he give us (as the church of Rome saith) evangelical counsels as additionals unto

the law? In no wise: Christ taught no other things than his apostles after his resurrection did preach; and his apostles taught no other things than Moses and the prophets had taught, Acts xxvi. 22. But these they taught after another manner than the scribes and Pharisees did, than the ordinary expositors of the law and the prophecies had done.

The same will of God is declared by Moses and the prophets, and by Christ; but more fully by Christ.

So that God's will concerning man was more fully declared by Christ than it was by Moses or by the prophets; the very true meaning of Moses himself and of the prophets was more fully revealed and clearly manifested unto mankind in Christ, than it was to Moses himself or to the prophets: *Unto me,* (saith our apostle, Eph. iii. 8—10,) *who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known by the church the manifold wisdom of God.* And by this more full declaration of God's will in Christ we Christians are tied unto more strict observance of his will known, than men were tied unto before Christ was declared to be the Lord: admitting the services to be the very same, yet the same services are now due under a double title: they are due to God the Father by right of creation, and due to Christ as he is Lord; for God the Father is to be honoured, not only in himself, but in Christ.

The first instance how Christians are bound more strictly to obey now, than Jews were before Christ.

6. God, when he gave the moral law to Israel, useth this preface, *I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt:* this was his peculiar right or title unto Israel, and the precept grounded upon this title follows, *Thou shalt have no other gods*

before me. But you may remember how it was foretold by the prophet Jeremiah, Jer. xxiii. 7, 8, that it should no more be said, *The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth, which brought up and which led the seed of the house of Israel out of the north country:* or, (according to the prime grammatical sense of the word principally intended by the Holy Ghost,) *out of the land of darkness:* and this was fulfilled only in Christ: so that he who was the Lord of Israel by right of redemption from Egyptian bondage, is now become the Lord of every language, of every nation and kindred, by a more peculiar title, by right of redemption from the powers of darkness, and from hell itself[p]: hence saith our apostle, 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, *Though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many, and lords many,) but to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him:* as the Israelites are forbid to have any other God besides the Lord which brought them out of the land of Egypt, so are we Christians forbid to have any lords or masters besides Christ: so saith our Saviour, Matt. xxiii. 8—10: *Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ. Call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.* And he repeats the former caveat, *Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ.* He that forbids them to be called masters over others, doth likewise forbid them to be servants to other masters besides himself: and this duty is more fully expressed by our apostle, 1 Cor. vii. 23; *Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.* He no way forbids bodily 372

[p] Mal. iv. 2. Matt. iv. 16. Luke ii. 32. John i. 6.

service, but rather enjoins such as were servants (properly so called, that is slaves or bondmen) to continue in their calling, vv. 20, 21, as knowing bodily servitude not to be incompatible with Christian liberty, no not with the liberty of the sons of God: *He that is called in the Lord, being a servant, is the Lord's freeman: likewise also he that is called, being free, is Christ's servant.* What service of men then doth Christ or his apostles forbid? The vassalage of our reason or understanding, or the submission of our consciences to the pleasures or services of men, or of the corrupt times wherein we live: thus to alienate our service from Christ to any mortal men is (whether you list to call it) a branch of sacrilege or idolatry, if not more gross, yet certainly more deadly in all such as confess Christ to be their Lord, than the worshipping of stocks and stones was either in the heathen or in the Israelites themselves, before Christ was declared to be the Son of God, and solemnly proclaimed to be the Lord. To give you another instance how God's will is more exactly done by real confession of Christ to be THE LORD.

What service of men is forbidden 1 Cor. vii. 23.

7. *This is the will of God*, saith the apostle, 1 Thess. iv. 3, *even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honour; not in the lust of concupiscence, even as the Gentiles which know not God.* To this duty the Israelites were as truly tied as we Christians are; it was (as the apostle intimates) a necessary branch or fruit of the true knowledge of God, a service due unto him as he was the Creator: but unto this same duty the Israelites were not bound by so many ties as we Christians are: it is required of us by a strict peculiar title, not only by our knowledge of God as our Creator, nor by our acknowledgment of Christ to be the Lord, as this title

A second instance of obedience more strictly enjoined Christians, than it was the Jews.

of *Lord* hath relation only unto servants; he may and doth exact this duty at our hands, not only by right of redemption, or by paying the ransom for our sins upon the cross, but by right of espousals, or by title of *Lord* as he is the Head and Husband of his spouse the Church: no motive can be so forcible to deter men from transgressing this negative commandment, or for encouraging them to do God's will in the affirmative part of the former commandment, as that of our apostle, 1 Cor. vi. 13—15: *Now the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord; and the Lord for the body.* 373 *And God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power. Know ye not that your bodies are the members of Christ? shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.* And again, ver. 20: *Ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.*

8. It was well observed long ago by Œcolampadius, that children were taught amiss to know the nature of God or of his enemy by vulgar pictures or representations: for so the fashion was long before, and continued till his time, to picture God, or the blessed Trinity, in some fair and beautiful form, and to paint the devil in some foul, loathsome, or ugly shape. And this good writer, to correct their error, well admonished, as well the parents as their children, "that if they would learn to know what God was, they must first be taught to know what goodness is, what justice is, what mercy is, what bounty or loving-kindness is;" and if they desire to know what manner of creature the devil is[q], who is the chief enemy of God, they should first be taught to know what malice is, what filthiness is, what loathsomeness is, what villainy or treachery is:

[q] See book 10. ch. 39. [vol. ix. p. 354, &c.]

for Satan is but a compost of these, or an extract of all that children or their parents acknowledge for evil. Howbeit, if either children or parents could be taught to know what justice is, what mercy is, what loving-kindness is; or if they could be taught to know that God is what all these are, even justice itself, even mercy itself, loving-kindness itself, wisdom itself; or wisdom, justice, mercy, and loving-kindness itself, truly infinite; yet his wisdom, his mercy, and loving-kindness would be to us incomprehensible, unapprehensible, even in that these attributes in him are infinite: we could have no true or lively apprehension, either speculative, to inform our understandings what were good, and ought to be followed; or moral, to enable and qualify our hearts and affections to imitate or express that pattern of goodness, or so much of it as we apprehend in God, if we should look upon these attributes as they are in God the Father only, or in the divine nature: but as he that cannot look upon the sun in its strength or brightness, or at the noonday, may take the model of it in the water, or in the moon at full; so we, that cannot behold the glory of Divine Majesty in the Godhead, may safely behold the map or model of his incomprehensible goodness in the man Christ Jesus: all his actions and endeavours were with such wisdom set and bent upon mercy, on goodness, on loving-kindness, that every one which saw and duly considered his manner and course of life here on earth might collect that he truly was (as himself avouched) more than the Son of man, the very Son of God himself, who is good and gracious to all; for Christ as man went about doing good to all, doing hurt to none. Now (as the son of Sirach saith, Ecclus. xxii. 3,) that *an evil son is the dishonour of his father;* so it will follow, by the rule of contraries, that a wise or good son is the

honour of his father: so Solomon hath said in express terms, Prov. x. 1; *A wise son maketh a glad father: but a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother.* Now Christ, as we know, is called *the wisdom* of the only wise immortal God, *his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased:* and well pleased with him he is, for that he is the honour of his Father: and as Christ by confessing God, and by real expression of his goodness in his life and actions, did truly glorify his Father, as he himself expressly avoucheth, John xvii; so all that really confess Christ to be the Lord, that is, all which throughly express the map or model of his goodness in their lives and conversations, do truly glorify God the Father.

9. Briefly then, *Every tongue* truly and rightly 374
confesseth Christ to be the Lord, that observes his commandments, or that observes the commandments of God more strictly and more religiously than others do, who, although they profess they honour God, yet do not honour him as *the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, or do not honour Jesus Christ as his only Son: this is that special *will* of the Father which is in heaven, and that which must be done by all which mean to enter into heaven, that every one which *honoureth the Father should also honour the Son*, John v. 23. Honour the Son they must, not in words or title only, but by performance of real service: every one that thus honoureth the Son doth hereby glorify God the Father: hence saith our Saviour, Matt. v. 16, *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.* And again, John xv. 1, our Saviour compares himself to the *vine*, and his Father unto a *husbandman*, which expects the fruit of his vineyard: so that the end why the Son of God did descend from heaven, why he was planted and

took root here on earth, was, that the sons of Adam, or Abraham, might be ingrafted in him; and the end of our ingrafting in him was, that we might bring forth fruit unto his Father[r].

But what comfort is it to have Christ our *Lord*, if by allegiance to him we be more strictly bound to do the will of God, than those which do not acknowledge him their Lord[s]? I answer; 1. It is a credit, (by consent of nations, and repute of men naturally wise,) if not a real comfort, to have him our Lord who governs his people by the most excellent and equitable laws: such were those which the Son of God gave the Jews: what are these, now, refined in the gospel! All men naturally desire happiness: as by those laws God directed the Jews[t], so by these he disciplines us for our good, seeking occasion or title in our obedience to exercise his bounty, by rewarding us for doing good to ourselves and others at his command: he that sins against the laws of Christ (doth it *in sui damnum*) sins against his own soul, and by straying from them goes out of that way which only can lead him to the happiness he desireth[u]. 2. It is comfort that our Lord rules not with rigour, but masters his dominion with equity: *novit figmentum nostrum:* having himself been compassed with the infirmities of man's nature, (all but such as did proceed from sin, or lead unto sin,) he can, by acquaintance and experience of them, tell both how willing the spirit and how weak the flesh of miserable mortals be; and ready is he to give allowance accordingly. But, thirdly, here is comfort indeed, that as *Jesus Christ the righteous* is our Lord, so he is *the*

[r] So Christ saith, John xv. 8: *Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be my disciples.*

[s] See how Salvian answers the like objection, in his fifth book, De Providentia.

[t] Deut. iv. 5—8.

[u] See the application, chap. 2. §. 5, 6. [p. 18, &c. of this volume.]

Lord our righteousness; so is he our Solicitor, our Advocate, our most compassionate High Priest, who, *ex officio*, negotiates on our behalf, by mediation and intercession with the Father, for pardon of all our transgressions, negligences, ignorances; both of all sins committed, and duties omitted, or performed untowardly and amiss: he made one propitiation by his death, and he lives for ever to make intercession for us. Yea, so gracious is this our Lord, that he seems, in a manner, (during this acceptable day, or time of grace,) to lay aside the title and dignity of *Lord*, and to put on the affection of a priest, perpetually to make intercession on our behalf, *for remission of sins past*, Rom. iii. 26, and for *grace, whereby* for the future *we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear. Seeing then we have so great an High Priest, let us hold fast our profession*.....And *let us come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.*

Worthy is THE LAMB *that was slain to receive* 375
power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing, Rev. v. 12. *And* THE LAMB *shall overcome them: for he is* LORD OF LORDS, *and* KING OF KINGS, Rev. xvii. 14.

SECTION III.

Of Christ's coming to Judgment.

2 CORINTH. V. 10.

For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.

Acts xvii. 30, 31. *But now God commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.*

Daniel vii. 9.

Rom. xiv. 9, &c. *To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living..... We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ..... Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.*

Rev. xx. 12.

CHAP. IX.

THE first words contain an undoubted maxim, or principal article of our faith, yea, such a plurality of articles of Christian belief, that I could not choose fitter, for continuation of my former argument concerning Christ's lordship or dominion: and his dominion (as was said before) was a dominion both of property and of jurisdiction: we are his servants, not our own men, as we say: we may not dispose of our own souls or bodies, much less of our bodily employments or endeavours, as we please, but as he pleases: or in case we wrong him, by alienating the employments of our bodies or of our souls from his service, who hath the full dominion of property, we cannot

exempt ourselves from his dominion of jurisdiction, to which all flesh is liable without appeal. Now of his dominion of jurisdiction, or of his royal power over us, the exercise of final judgment is the principal part: and of this judgment the general sum or abstract is contained in 2 Cor. v. 10.

An advertisement concerning holy scripture.

Before I enter upon the particulars therein contained, I am in general to advertise, 'That albeit the scripture be such a complete rule of Christian faith, that neither those which are appointed to interpret the scriptures ought to propose or commend any point or doctrine as an article of faith unto others, nor are others bound to believe any thing as a point of faith, unless it be either expressly contained in the 376
scriptures, or may out of the express testimonies of them be deduced by infallible rules of reason and art; yet in the things believed, because contained in scripture, there is a difference to be observed. Some things we believe without any ground at all besides the mere authority of scriptures; other things we believe from the authority of scriptures too, yet so as we have the truth which the scriptures teach concerning them ensealed unto us by experiments answering to the rules of scriptures.' And these experiments be of two sorts; either observable in the general book of nature and course of times; or observable in ourselves. Of this latter rank are the articles of the Godhead—of the creation—of Divine Providence—of original sin—of final judgment—and of life and death everlasting.

Experiments in nature, and in ourselves or consciences, confirm the truths of holy scripture.

The being of a Godhead, or divine Power, the very heathens, which knew not scriptures, did in some sort believe: of God's providence, and of judgment after this life, the heathens likewise had divers notions, which were as rude materials, or stuff unwrought: the

frame or fashioning of which notions into true and Christian belief cannot otherwise be effected than by the rules of scripture, which are the lines by which the structure or edifice of faith must be squared or wrought. Now whatsoever the heathens without the help of scriptures or divine revelations did believe or conceive concerning the points mentioned, every Christian man which doth believe the scriptures, though but by an historical faith, may much better believe and conceive by the help of scriptures, albeit his affections be not as yet sanctified by the Spirit of grace, although he be but in the estate of a mere moral or natural man, so he be not delivered up unto a reprobate sense.

The branches then of my meditations concerning this grand article of Christ's coming to judgment shall be in general these:

Five general points.

First, Of the natural notions which the heathens had, and which every natural man (so his conscience be not seared) may have experienced in himself of a final judgment after this life, or of a recompense according to his ways or works.

The second, By what authority of scriptures the exercise of this final judgment is appropriated to Christ.

The third, The manner of Christ's coming to judgment.

The fourth, The parties that are to be judged, to wit, the quick and the dead.

The fifth, The sentence or award of this great Judge; and that is, everlasting life or everlasting death.

Thus, you see, three principal articles of our Creed, to wit, this of Christ's coming to judge the quick and the dead, and the two last, viz. the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting, are so linked toge-

ther, that they cannot be so commodiously explained in several, as they may be in this proposed link or chain.

CHAP. X.

Of the natural Notions which the Heathens had, and the internal Experiments which every true Christian may have, answering to these Notions of a final Judgment.

Heathen notions, of two sorts.

1. THE notions which the heathens had of a judgment to pass upon them after this life were of two sorts; either implicit and indirect, such as give better 377
testimony to us, than they made of it to themselves; or direct and express, though indefinite and imperfect, and mingled for the most part with some error. And these latter are most frequent in the ancient heathen poets; many of whose testimonies to this purpose are so express and direct, that they may well seem to have been taken from some scattered traditions of that truth which God had revealed unto the patriarchs before the law was written, or from the written law itself, which it is probable Plato, with some other philosophers and poets, had read, at the least received at the second hand. However, "unless the truth concerning this point delivered in scriptures had been imperfectly implanted in men's hearts by nature, these mere natural men could not have submitted their assent or opinions unto it."

The Pythagorean notion.

That not the ancient poets only, but the ancient philosophers, had an express notion of pains or torments, which the wicked after this life were to suffer, we may gather from Aristotle, Poster. lib. 2. cap. 11. For so he tells us, that the Pythagoreans did assign this final cause of thunder, namely, "to terrify such as were reserved in infernal prisons." And in assigning

this final cause of thunder, whose material and efficient cause, with its properties, they were not ignorant of, they did acknowledge an higher guide or governor of these natural effects than nature herself. We may perhaps rectify this notion by saying, 'The thunder was created by this guide or governor of nature, rather to terrify such as live here on earth, that they come not into these infernal prisons.' And to avoid or prevent their coming into them, nature herself, which taught Pythagoras this philosophy, might teach all, 'That there can be no means so safe, or so compendious, as the making of our peace with that Divine Power, who speaks to men in this terrible language.' *The thunder of his power*, saith Job, xxvi. 14, *who can understand?* But the less we understand it in particular, the better we understand him to be a terrible Judge. That this notion which the thunder did suggest to the Pythagorean philosophers of the Divine Power, as avenger of evil, was not a philosophical fancy, but implanted by nature in the heart, may be further evinced; for that the thunder did imprint the like fear in such as in words or opinion did deny the Divine Providence, or sought to shake off all conceit of future judgment. Witness the emperor Caligula, who so demeaned himself in his empire and tyranny over others, as if he never looked to be called to any account for his regency; and yet this man (as Suetonius tells us) would rise from the table when it thundered, and ofttimes for fear run under his bed; he knew himself exempt from the censure or control of man, and had enough about him to instruct him in the natural causes of thunder; and yet by this strange fear he did acknowledge a superior Judge, from whose presence or apprehension he sought to hide himself, as

malefactors do themselves from the eyes or hands of earthly judges, or from the ministers of civil justice.

2. But might not this strange fear arise rather from some peculiar disposition in Caligula, than from any instinct of nature, universal to all such as he was, upon the like or equivalent summons or admonitions? From whatsoever disposition we can imagine this servile or slavish fear should proceed, it was a timorous disposition, and could not have wrought or inclined such men as he was unto such manifest documents of imminent fear, but from a feeling consciousness of a foul and beastly life; for he was a man that in other cases had gotten as full a conquest over his conscience, 378 as any man, prince or subject, in this life can possibly get. He had with much care and cost lulled his conscience with variety of all pleasures, incident to sense or earthly affections, into so dead a sleep, that no voice of man, though ambassador from God, no voice of God, (known to men,) besides this terrible voice of his thunder, could have awaked it. But amongst ten thousand such as he was, that is, of such as for the most part have lived as beasts, and for this reason could desire to die like beasts, without any account or reckoning how they had spent their lives, it will be hard to find one, that in some or other particular did not give a true crisis or proof of this truth, which now we teach, (that is, of a judgment after this life,) by nature implanted in their hearts; albeit most of them in words would not confess it—albeit many of them used their own and their parasites' wits by natural reasons to overthrow or enervate the force of it. But as in cases of civil justice, the unwitting acknowledgment of some material or pertinent circumstances, drawn from such as otherwise seek to conceal or smother the main truth, (upon which they are directly

examined,) is, with intelligent judges, of more force than one or two voluntary testimonies of men suspected to be accessaries in the business, or partial favourers of the principal actor; so in this controversy betwixt God and our own consciences, the unwitting practices (or passionate expressions made in some extremity) of such heathens, as either denied or knew not the truth of a final judgment, do give more powerful and more authentic testimonies for it, than either the authority or express testimony of other heathens, which did expressly or directly affirm it, (save only so far as their testimony was grounded upon the like instinct of nature, or implanted notion, which did move the others to confess it indirectly or in practice, although in words they did deny it, or not confess it,) do for it, or than the avowed denials of any more debauched heathens in their jollity do against it.

3. "In many cases, as well natural and moral as divine, there may be a real and solid truth, or ground of truth in the practice, without any apprehension of it in the practitioner; ofttimes with opposition to it in his conceit or opinion." Most men, when they desire to call things forgotten to mind, will rub or scratch the back part of their head. The ground or reason of their practice is from nature herself, which hath placed the faculty of memory in that part of the brain, or at least in some other part, betwixt which and that which they so handle there is special intercourse. Howbeit most men observe this practice or custom by mere instinct of nature, without so much as once questioning or thinking whether their faculty of memory be seated in the brain or in the breast. And some perhaps do use this custom, being of a contrary opinion, viz., that the memory is seated in the forepart of the brain. But their manifest conformity to others in this custom,

will, in any indifferent moderator's judgment, prevailingly prescribe against their opinion. Few there be again so destitute of natural reason, but would be able, as occasion requires, or exigents impel, to give warmth to some things that were cold, and to cool other things that be hot, by blowing or breathing upon them. Yet this custom is practised by most out of mere instinct of nature, without thought or question how two such contrary effects as heat and cold could possibly issue from one and the same mouth or breath. There is a true and real cause of this diversity or contrariety in the effects, and a true reason in nature how they are wrought, albeit this cause or reason be neither in whole nor in part apprehended by such as 379
practise it with success. Yea, of such as have their senses exercised in the study of philosophy, scarce one of five there is, but if he should on the sudden be put thus to practise by rule of art, would fail of his purpose, more than such as thus practise by mere instinct of nature; or would be as far to seek, if he were put to give the true reason of it, as the poor pilgrim in the fable was, who, being kindly entertained by a satyr, which had found him blowing his fingers for extremity of cold in the woods, was unkindly thrust out of his house, only for seeking to cool his broth with the same breath wherewith he had warmed his fingers.

4. But in what practices or resolutions in the heathen was this divine truth of a judgment after this life necessarily included? The particulars are many; but most of them may be reduced unto this general: 'As many of the heathens as either esteemed the love of virtue, honesty, or godliness, more dear than this mortal life with its appurtenances temporal; or as many of them as did abhor the practice of any villainy or impiety more than death; whatsoever they themselves did

expressly say or think concerning this article of final judgment in particular, did by these practices or resolutions give authentic testimony unto it.' Now that virtue or honesty were to be more esteemed than this mortal life, with all the commodities of it, the most part of heathen philosophers (besides the sect of Epicures) did grant and maintain. The Stoicks went further in the esteem of moral virtue than any wise Christian will do in practice, than any good Christian ought to do in opinion: but of their errors or hyperboles anon. Aristotle, the prince of philosophers, grants, that there is ἁπλῶς ἀγαθόν; that some things be absolutely good, so good that a man ought to love them more than life, or rather to abandon life than their practice. Some things, again, he grants absolutely evil; so evil, that a man ought rather to choose death than adventure upon them; such are treason against our native country, incest, perjury, &c. This great philosopher, in expressly granting thus much, is necessarily concluded by his own principles to grant a life after this life ended much better than this; and a death, or an estate of life much worse than death, to such as have lived and died dishonestly. Nor is he thus far concluded only by his own principles, but by the very principles of nature, whose chief secretary he was. For every thing that hath being doth by an indispensable law of nature desire the continuance of such being as it hath; but most of all of its well-being, or bettering of its present estate. Now if man's hopes or fears were terminated in this life, (as needs they must with this life be terminated, unless we grant a judgment after death, or an award of the evils which men fear, or of the good things which they hope,) every man were bound in reason and by nature to seek the preservation or continuance of his own life

before all things in the world besides. Nothing were to be esteemed worse than a bodily death, nothing so good as continuation of bodily life with health and competency. Much better it were to be a part of this visible world than utterly not to be. To avoid or put off this utter not-being so long as were possible, no device could be dishonest, no practice amiss. We do not blame brute beasts for making what shift they can for maintaining or saving their lives; no means which they can use to this end only are by us accounted foul; for, as we say, they do but follow kind, or do as nature directs them. But what is the reason why in thus doing they do not amiss, nor deserve blame? Because nothing can be so ill to them as death, nothing so good as life. But for a man to transform himself into a beast, or to continue beastly or filthy practices, for 380
continuance or preservation of his bodily life, this the very heathens did detest, as unnatural, base, and odious. What was the reason? They saw by light of nature that man had better hopes than beasts are capable of, as it were wrapped up for him in the constant practice of honesty and virtue; and was capable withal of greater evil, which might accrue from a dishonest and filthy life, than any evil that is incident to the nature of beasts: yet did not that good which good men did aim at, either in practice of virtue or by declining vice, always betide them in this life, in the judgment of most heathen.

5. Two things there were which most later heathens (not the Stoicks only) did highly extol in Regulus: the one, that he did prefer the love of his country before the contentments of this life, which he might have enjoyed in plenteous manner: the other, that he did prefer a lingering and cruel death before the stain or guilt of perjury: for being in hold or durance amongst

the Carthaginians, he was remitted to Rome, upon oath that if he did not effect what they had given him in charge to treat for, he should return again to Carthage, and undergo such punishment as they should think fit to inflict: it was in his power to have effected with the Romans that which the Carthaginians did desire, but he would not use his power to persuade, but rather to dissuade the Romans from condescending to their enemies' desire, because he saw it would be prejudicial to their commonweal and posterity, though advantageous to him in particular: but he accounted it rather loss than gain, as well to himself as to the Roman state, to save the life, though of some worthy peer, as he was, by breach of oath, or perjury; and in this resolution he returned unto the Carthaginians, although he knew they resolved to put him to cruel and lingering torture. The observation upon this resolution of Regulus (which will generally serve for all the like, by what heathen soever practised or commended) is briefly this: 'No human practice or resolution can be truly commendable, but only so far as it helps to make the practitioner a better man than he was before, or could continue to be, without such practice.' Was Regulus then a better man by this practice, than without it he could have been? or did it truly propagate or continue that goodness which before he had? If he by doing this did not continue his former goodness, or become a better man, his commendations are unjust—the fact itself was not truly commendable—was no argument either of reason or wit in the practiser, or of honesty in the resolution: if by this resolution he became a better man than before he was, or without it could have been, somewhat of Regulus did, after the accomplishment of this fact, remain to receive the due reward of this

resolution, as either his soul, his body, or both: for every real accident or attribute necessarily supposeth a real subject to support it; and if no better doom had been reserved for Regulus than that which the Carthaginians, his chief judges on earth, did award him, he could not possibly either have continued or bettered his well-being by undertaking it; it was altogether impossible for him to become a better man by this practice, by which he doth utterly cease to be a man, if his hopes had been terminated with this mortal life, or if he had not remained capable of reward or punishment after death.

That very thing was even by the verdict of the heathen highly magnified in Regulus, (a wise statesman and good patriot,) which in a brute beast, of what kind soever, would have been accounted, and that justly, more than unreasonableness, a very madness: for no beast, unless it be altogether mad, will 381
evidently expose itself to death. That which exempts Regulus's wittingly exposing of himself to a more cruel death than any sober man could find in his heart to put a dumb beast unto, from censure of folly, was, the managing of his undertakings by resolution and reason: and all the reason that he had thus to resolve, was, that he hoped not utterly to perish as beasts do, although certain he was to die. Beasts, which run upon their own deaths, are therefore accounted mad, because by death they utterly cease from being what they were: for them to desire death, is to desire their utter destruction, which they could not desire, but seek by all means possible to avoid, unless they had first put off all common sense, wherein the height of their madness consists: Regulus was therefore accounted manly resolute, and resolutely wise, for that in choosing rather to die than to live with stain of

perjury, or taint his soul with breach of oath, he did not desire his own destruction, but the continuation of his well-being, or bettering his own or his country's estate: and this his desire or resolution, (which supposeth another sentence after this life ended,) the heathens, which so highly magnified his resolution, did subscribe unto as good, and fit to be imitated by all honest men and true patriots, albeit perhaps most of them were unwilling to be his seconds in like attempts, when the matter came to the trial.

6. Nor did the Romans only commend this resolution in Regulus, whose memory for well deserving of that commonweal they had in perpetual reverence; but other heathens, which did detest the very name of Christians, and eagerly sought the extirpation of Christ's church on earth, did as much admire and commend the like in Christian bishops. Two memorable stories, very apposite to this purpose, come to my mind; the one related by St. Gregory Nazianzen[a], the other by St. Austin. Nazianzen's story is of bishop Marcus Arethusus, who was sentenced to a cruel death and torture by Julian the emperor, unless he would at his own cost and charges build up an idol temple which he had caused to be pulled down. After that his persecutors had brought the damages required at his hands so low, that if he would be content to give but an angel, or some small piece of gold, current in those times, to the reedifying of the temple which he had destroyed, he should live; yet he persevered so constantly in his former resolution, which was, not to give so much as a penny by way of contribution for building up any house of iniquity, that his persecutors were ashamed to take life from him.

[a] S. G. Nazianzen's story of bishop Marcus Arethusus is in his third Oration, or former invective against Julian.

St. Augustin (in his tract against lying) tells us of bishop Firmus[b], who, being pressed to bewray another Christian brother, (whose death (or turning) the heathens earnestly sought, having strong presumptions that this good bishop knew where he was,) after many torments, and threats of more, with great constancy refused: all the words that they could wrest from him were these, *Mentiri non possum*, "I cannot lie;" (and yet he must have lied, if he had denied that he knew where the party was whose life they sought;) "but as I cannot lie, so I cannot become a traitor, or bewrayer of my brother: do what you will or can unto me." S. Austin's story of bishop Firmus.

This constant resolution, as St. Austin testifies, did so turn the edge of his persecutors' malice into admiration and reverence of his integrity, that they dismissed him with honour: howbeit, there had been no wit or praiseworthiness in the practice, unless the practiser had expected some better sentence after death, (to which he did thus constantly expose himself,) than 382
the applause of these heathens, which he could not hope for, which he did not expect. And the heathens, in commending and admiring his constancy and integrity, did, though faintly or unwittingly, yet necessarily, subscribe unto the truth of his hopes or belief of a judgment after death; as also unto that oracle of God, delivered by his apostle, that *seeing Christ hath laid down his life for us, we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren*, 1 John iii. 16: at least we ought to expose ourselves to bodily death, rather than suffer them to be put upon the hazard of death eternal: as it is likely this good bishop feared, lest he should hazard this poor Christian's soul, whose

[b] Metaphrastes hath a story of Anthimus, bishop of Nicomedia, partly like this.

death or turning the heathens sought, being not so certain of his resolution as of his own, but doubtful whether he would not deny Christ, or renounce the Christian faith rather than suffer such tortures as he now felt, or expose himself to such a violent and cruel death as they threatened him with.

7. Again, the most wise and learned among the heathen philosophers did place felicity or true happiness in the constant practice of virtue, as in temperance, justice, wisdom, &c. The Stoicks were so wedded to this opinion, that they held virtue to be a sufficient recompense to itself, at what rate soever it was purchased or maintained; though with the loss of life and limbs, with the most exquisite and lingering tortures that our senses are capable of. They esteemed Regulus more happy even in the midst of his torments, than his persecutors were or could be in the height of their mirth and prosperity, or in the perfect fruition of their health, or best contentments of their senses or understandings; yea, so far they went, that they judged Regulus to perpetual happiness, albeit he had been perpetually or everlastingly so tormented as for a time he was. But this is more (as was formerly intimated) than any good Christian is bound to believe; nay, we are bound to believe the contrary. For so St. Paul (who was more virtuously constant than Regulus was in his profession; more than virtuously, religiously constant in all the ways of godliness) tells us, 1 Cor. xv. 19, that *if in this life only we had hope*, (that is, were quite without hopes of a better life than this present is,) *we* (Christians, such good Christians as he himself was) *were of all men the most miserable.*

The opinion of the Stoicks.

The heathen then (the Stoicks especially) did well and wisely in acknowledging felicity to consist in virtue—in acknowledging virtue to be a full recompense to

How virtue is a reward to itself.

itself, in respect of any temporary evil or punishment that could be opposed unto it. They wisely resolved in holding them more happy which did suffer torments for a good cause, than they which made it a part of their pleasure or happiness to torment them. Yet it is not possible that the entire and uninterrupted possession, or the undisinheritable tenor of virtue complete, should always in this life be a sufficient recompense to itself, or able to countervail all the costs or grievances wherewith the most virtuous or most godly men that live may in this life be charged. Virtue then, or godliness, is in this life a sufficient recompense to itself *spe* only, not *re;* so far as it is the only way to our union with God or with Christ, who is to all the sons of Abraham (as he professed himself to Abraham, Gen. xv. 1.) their *exceeding great reward.* Nor could true happiness consist in virtue, if our hopes or fruition of it might be terminated with this life. In what sense then is felicity said to consist in virtue? Only so far as our assured hope of a better life after death is unseparably annexed, and indissolubly wedded unto the constant practice of virtue and godliness in this life. Without assurance of this hope, that magnificent confidence which the Stoicks put in virtue was but a vain ima- 383
gination in respect of themselves: and for this reason, albeit all of them were more than Christians, hyperbolical Christians in their speculative commendations of virtue, yet many of them were in practice as cowardly as other heathen. And no marvel, seeing it is this hope which must strengthen other graces of God in us, and enable our spirits to countersway the contrary inclinations of natural fear of death, or torments in the day of trial: *Cast not away your confidence,* saith the apostle, Heb. x. 35, 36, *which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience,*

that, after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise. And again, Heb. xii. 1, 2: *Let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God.* As to encourage ourselves to do well with hope or conceit of meriting any thing at God's hand, is pride and presumption (a natural branch of popish superstition); so not to strengthen ourselves, or quicken our patience in the suffering of any bodily evils that for Christ's cause can befall us, with hope of reward, or certain expectance of a better sentence to be pronounced by a supreme Judge, is but a branch of the blind Stoick's affection, or of his forced and affected zeal to virtue. And it is no better than a stoical doctrine or error, which some have taught, that we are to do good merely for goodness' sake, *sine intuitu mercedis,* without any eye or respect to our reward or recompense. It is an error, if it be persisted in, so much more dangerously heretical in divinity than theirs was in philosophy, by how much we are more deeply bound than they were, not to sever those things, by niceties or speculative distinctions, which God hath indissolubly conjoined, and whose conjunction the Son of God himself, whilst he lived on earth, hath by his practice and example ratified unto us. And St. Paul delivers it as a point of useful doctrine to the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. iv. 13, to comfort themselves against the terrors and assaults of death (whether made upon themselves or upon their friends) with hope of a resurrection to a better life. Now it were impossible for any man to comfort him-

Gen. xv. 1. Heb. xi. 26. Phil. iii. 14. Heb. xii. 2. Rom. ii. 7.

self with this hope, without intuition or respect unto this *great reward* that God hath to bestow on men. For greater reward he hath none to bestow than life eternal, nor is man capable of any like unto it. But of this point more fully when we come to the last point proposed, to wit, the sentence or award of this final judgment.

8. But now to shut up the first point, concerning the natural notions which the heathens had (and the internal experiments which every true Christian may have answering to these notions) of a final judgment. The sum of all is comprised by our apostle, Rom. ii. 14—16, whose words are a full confirmation of what hath been before observed concerning the heathens: (*.....When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another;) in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.* It was no part of our apostle's meaning, that the consciences of these heathens should not give in their evidence or accusations until the day of final judgment. No; their evidence shall in that day appear more full and public, *when God shall judge the secrets of the heart;* but even in this secrecy of 384
the heart there was an evidence, though private, yet full enough to themselves of a judgment to come. The apostle's speech is distributively universal: every man's thoughts do accuse or excuse him for all his own deeds respectively. And no marvel, seeing the notions of good and evil are as naturally implanted in our souls as the notions of truth and falsehood;

Notions of good and evil as fresh as those of true and false.

and children (so such as have the tuition of them would be careful, so their parents were not more delighted to ripen their wits, than to ripen the seeds of morality) might as soon be taught to put a difference betwixt things sacred and profane, as between the right hand and the left. But this is our misery, that these notions of good or evil are sooner corrupted and choked, than our notions of truth and falsehood. Yet, however, the working of conscience cannot utterly be choked or deaded in any, although the voice of it be ofttimes unheard, although most men seek to stifle it.

9. The internal experiments which certify the Christian of a judgment to come, be so frequent and forcible, that pains will be better spent in persuading men to take notice of them, than in a long discourse of them. It is the chief wisdom of a Christian, the very life of Christian sobriety, not to exceed so much in mirth, though honest, harmless, and in season, nor in the frequency of any business, though indifferent and lawful, as not to allot the secrets of our hearts and consciences some set hours and times for audience. Multiplicity of business, without interposition of vacancies to this purpose, is but like perpetual noise and clamour in a court of justice; and not to use some retired interims for examination of our souls, is but as if men should continually laugh or brawl, whilst the officers of the court enjoin peace or silence. So often then as we shall perceive our conscience either expressly to check us, or inwardly to work, let us still call to mind, that it now is *in executione officii;* and its office is to be our remembrancer of that which our apostle admonisheth us, 1 Cor. xi. 31, *If we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged.* In this judgment or examination of ourselves, nature herself would teach us thus much, so we would be observant

of the process, that seeing conscience is not only the lamp of the Lord, but also a part of ourselves, a principal ray or beam of our souls, it could not be so suspicious of our actions, or so inquisitive after every circumstance that may make against us when we do evil, unless it were deputed by a supreme Judge to bring us to a judgment, and either in this life to acquit us, by persuading us to judge ourselves, or in that last day to accuse and condemn us. It would teach us again, that albeit there be a general day for final judgment appointed, wherein Christ himself shall sit as Judge, yet he every day holds or calls a private sessions within our breasts, wherein conscience sits his attorney or deputy. Again, let us still remember, that albeit the work of the law be written in our hearts—so it was in the hearts of the very heathens—that albeit we give conscience full audience, and leave to examine us by the law of God, whether written in our hearts or in the sacred book, yet is it but a small part of our accounts which we shall be able to read in the register of our own consciences, in respect of what is to be found written in that book or scroll which shall be opened and unfolded in the day of final judgment, Rev. xx. 12. Howbeit, even so much as every man (which will diligently hearken to his own conscience) shall in this life be able to read and hear distinctly, will make deep impression in his heart, and wound his very spirit; and, as Solomon speaks, *a wounded spirit who can bear?* rather, who can heal it? None but he that shall be our Judge. Yet may we not look that when he shall come to judge all, he will vouchsafe to 385
heal any. He *healeth all our infirmities* as he is our High Priest, not as he is our Judge; and so healed by him our consciences must be in this life, otherwise the wound will prove deadly and incurable in that last

The jealousy and inquisitiveness of conscience, shews that it is deputed by God as our visitor or supervisor.

day. Nothing besides the wounds of Christ can cure the wounds and sores of our spirits and consciences: therefore was he smitten and bruised, therefore was he wounded unto death, that his blood poured forth might be as a fountain of oil or balm to cure and heal the brokenhearted: for the brokenhearted only are his true patients. All of us, one time or other, must feel the sting of serpents more fiery than such as stung the Israelites in the wilderness, even the sting of death, and of that old serpent, (which, in our first parents, envenomed our nature,) before we can thirst after this fountain of life with that fervency of spirit which he requireth in his patients. Without this thirst, thus occasioned by this sting of conscience, and poison of sin in some measure apprehended by us, we cannot drink the water of life, or suck in the balm of health and salvation, which issued out of Christ's wounds, in such a plentiful measure as may cure the festered wounds of our souls and consciences, and purge us from that corruption which we and our fathers have sucked from our first parents, or contracted by the incessant overflow of our actual and daily sins.

The checks and gratulations of our consciences, be tastes or pledges of the twofold award that shall be given at the last day.

10. Yet is not this apprehension of our actual and daily sins, or the smart or sting of conscience, so perpetually uncessant in any one of us, but that we may feel or perceive some interposed gleams of joy and comfort, some gratulations of our consciences for businesses sincerely managed by us, or for those particular actions or good deeds, which, in respect of some one or other circumstance, we have done amiss, but for their substance well, and with a good intention, and without a sinister respect to our own private temporal ends, or to the prejudice of others with whom we live. So that no man, unless he be much wanting to himself, can

want undoubted experiments in himself of a future and final judgment; or of the twofold sentence which in it shall be awarded to all, according to the diversity of their ways. As often then as any of us shall feel the sting, or perceive the check of our consciences for the evils we have done, let us take this irksomeness or indisposition of our minds and souls, not for a mere effect of natural melancholy, (though that perhaps may concur as a cause to increase our heaviness,) but rather take all together as a crisis of that disease growing upon our souls, which, unless it be cured by our heavenly Physician in this life, will prove incurable in that last and dreadful day, and will bring upon us perpetual *weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth.* If our consciences, again, at any time shall congratulate us for well-doing, we may take these congratulations or applauses of our souls and spirits, as so many undoubted pledges or earnests of that unspeakable and uncessant joy, which the supreme Judge shall award to all that by constancy in well-doing acknowledge him for their sovereign Lord, and expect him as their supreme Judge: if we cease not to continue these good actions or performances, he will not cease to renew the undoubted pledges or earnests of eternal joy unto us daily: for so St. Paul saith[c], *He will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life: but unto them that are contentious, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish,* &c.

11. The best use which the heathens (as mere heathens) made of such notions as nature had implanted in them of a future judgment; or rather their misap- 386
plications of what nature did rightly suggest unto

[c] Rom. ii. 6, 7, &c.

them to this purpose, cannot better be resembled than by the use or applications which men naturally make of dreams: now of dreams, some are vain and idle, as arising only from the garboils of the fantasy, (most frequent in men sick or distempered,) or from such thoughts, discourses, or speeches, as we have entertained by day, or been entertained with for some short time before: of these dreams, and of their serious observation, that of the son of Sirach, Ecclus. xxxiv. 1, 2, 3, is most true: *The hopes of a man void of understanding are vain and false: and dreams lift up fools. Whoso regardeth dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow, and followeth after the wind. The vision of dreams is like the resemblance of one thing to another, even as the likeness of a face to a face.* Howbeit, even such dreams may be resolved into some natural causes precedent. Nor do men fail in the apprehension of particulars represented, (which is always more lively by night than by day,) but in the application or composition of such representations whilst they dream: this commonly is as imperfect or monstrous, as if one should be able to name his letters right, but not able to spell or make a syllable otherwise than by rote or guess; or apt to put those syllables ill-favouredly together, which he had severally spelled not much amiss.

The heathen notions of a final judgment vanished like dreams.

Like to men's apprehensions of these dreams were most speculations of the heathens concerning the truth or manner of a final judgment, or future resurrection, whose indefinite notions nature had implanted in their hearts. So vain and idle they were for the most part in their collections or applications of what they conceived, that no more credence was to be given unto their particular speculations or doctrine, than unto a sick man's apprehensions of his present dream.

But however many of them did write and speak of a future judgment more out of art and imitation of others, than out of any solid experiments; yet was it not possible that the wits of all or most of them, of the ancients especially, should have been set a working in this argument, without some undoubted and experienced impulsions of nature, seeking to lead or drive them upon that truth which we Christians are expressly taught by a better Master than nature.

A discourse about dreams.

12. Other dreams there be, which are reputed natural, whose observation is very useful, because they have real causes in nature, and always exhibit either a true crisis or notice of men's present estate of body, or some right prognostics of some disease growing upon them, whose original or progress is to their waking thoughts unsensible or unapprehended. Howbeit, the right interpretation or signification of such suggestions or intimations as nature gives to men in dreams is usually unknown, or much mistaken for the present, by the parties to whom they are immediately made by nature; they must be expounded or judged of by the physician or philosopher. Some men, no way distempered, or disquieted in thought, have dreamed that some part of their legs or arms have been turned into a stone, or into an icy substance. The apprehension or composition was vain and false, yet not without a true and observable cause. The physician did by the relation of the circumstances perceive (as the event did prove) a cold humour beginning to settle in that part of the body whose transformation was represented in the dream, and gathered withal, that the humour not thence removed would breed a numbness or oppression of the nerves in that part. Others ofttimes dream (not from any thoughts or discourses to that purpose) 387
that they are flying in the air, or can jump from one

place to another, further distant than any man can conceive it possible for himself or other terrestrial creatures to leap or skip. The philosopher or physician knows this or the like representation made in sleep, not occasioned from any late waking thoughts, to be a token of a clean stomach, of pure blood, or lively spirits. Others, I have heard of, in the midst of their quiet sleep, have suddenly cried out, as if they had been stabbed under the ribs. Themselves, after they awaked, and such as heard them before they were awaked, knew the conceit or apprehension to be altogether false, yet not vain or idle in respect of the cause or observation. The skilful physician, from this their misapprehension, rightly apprehended a salt humour, violently distilling upon the lungs, ready to breed a dangerous consumption, whose removal would have been more difficult, had not nature given this imperfect advice or forewarning for the speedy prevention of it: this secret advice or forewarning of nature was so much the more to be credited, because no occasion of any quarrel, no thought or discourse tending to the representation of any such fear, had presented itself to the waking thoughts of the party thus dreaming for a long time before. Every real occasion of joy or fear, the very least annoyance or pleasance, that can befall our bodies in night sleep or slumber, (as the philosopher long ago observed,) is apt to misinform our common sense, or judicative faculty, being now surprised by sleep, with representations or conceits of the greatest delight or fear that is of the same kind with that which is really represented: as, if a drop of sweet phlegm do distil upon the swallowing place, it raiseth an apprehension of honey, or other sweetmeat, to which the taste of the party thus dreaming hath been accustomed; and from

this original, hungry men in their sleep feed their fantasies with apprehension of pleasant banquets. Abundance of choler ofttimes raiseth an apprehension of some great fire: and nothing more common than for men, troubled with flux of rheum from the brain, to dream of drowning, or danger by floods or water: the least oppression of the motive faculty will occasion the *ephialtes* or *gigas*, that affection which we commonly call *the mare*. In all these and the like affections nature doth her part, however the parties to whom she secretly suggests these signs or tokens of their bodily estate or constitution do for the most part grossly err in their constructions of them, until they be rectified or better instructed by the physician or philosopher, who only know the natural causes of such representations by sleep, which is as a false glass, wherein every thing appears much greater to the fantasy than in nature it is, or would appear to our vigilant senses.

13. In like manner, the best apprehensions or collections which the heathens made of those real notions which are by nature implanted (of a final judgment) were erroneous; their doctrinal speculations or expressions were no better than an ignorant man's apprehension of his natural dreams; howbeit, even the speculations of such heathens, as did most err in particular, do minister much matter of true and useful contemplation unto the Christian divine, part of whose office it is, or should be, to search the original of others' errors, whose rectification must be made by the scripture, which is the rule of life; without whose aphorisms or directions, the apprehension of natural notions or suggestions (even when they work most strongly) would lead or push the physicians of souls themselves into heresy.

Though heathen notions were like dreams, Christian divines may see realities of truth in them.

388 Of all the sects of heathen philosophers, the sect of Epicures did seek most earnestly to exempt themselves from the jurisdiction, and their actions from the cognizance of a Divine Providence; yet could they not so dead the working of the notion of it in themselves, or hoodwink their own understandings so close, as not to apprehend or observe the working of it in others. Epicurus[d] himself, albeit he placed felicity in the moderate pleasures of this life, (though not in bodily pleasures only, for he was not so gross as to exclude the delights or pleasures of the soul or mind, but rather required a competency of bodily pleasures for the fruition of this delight;) yet, however he failed in his apprehensions of felicity, or in his application of those good lessons which nature did suggest unto him, he found himself tied by bond of conscience to observe the law of nature: the original of his positive error was an ignorance or blindness common to him and most heathen, in some degree or other, in not being able to discern the corruption of nature from nature herself, or to distinguish between the suggestions or intimations of nature, as it sometimes was, and universally might have continued, and the particular suggestions or longings of nature, as it was corrupted or tainted in himself or others, more or less in all. It was a principle of his doctrine, as Seneca tells us, "that nature" (which he professed to follow as his guide) "did abhor all vice or wickedness:" it seems he held those courses or habits of life only vicious, which we Christians account unnatural or prodigious vices, as tyranny, cruelty, or excessive luxury. And such vices as these, the most heathens (whom corruption of nature did lead blindfold into many grievous sins, and cast such a mist before their eyes as made

[d] Touching Epicurus, see book 10. [vol. ix.]

unlawful pleasures appear unto them as parts of true happiness) did by the light of nature detest, as contrary to the unapprehended remnants or relics of God's image yet inherent in them, though mingled with corruption, or much defaced with the image of Satan.

How Epicurus did collect, that nature detested vice.

But from what grounds of nature or experiments did this author or first founder of the sect of Epicures collect, that nature did detest all wickedness? Thus he did reason and collect—*Quia sceleratis etiam inter tuta timor est*—because he saw such as had polluted their consciences with wicked and prodigious practices, to live in fear, even whilst they seemed to have safety herself for their guard against all external occurrences, whose probable assaults or annoyances human policy could possibly forecast. And none more subject to this slavish fear, which their consciences did inwardly suggest, than such as for their greatness, and confidence in tyranny and cruelty, were most terrible to others[e]. What was it then which these men did so much fear? No other men, nor any revenge that man could attempt upon them. What then? The company of themselves, or solitary conference with their own consciences: yet no man's conscience can make his heart afraid, unless the conscience itself be first affrighted. What is it, then, which the consciences of supreme earthly judges, or monarchs absolute by right of conquest, can so much fear in the height of their temporal security? The censure (doubtless) or check of some superior Judge. If this fear had been vain, or but a speculative fancy, it could not have been universal or general in all or most wicked men, specially in such as were by nature terrible and stout, and wary withal to

[e] See the conference betwixt Dionysius and Damocles. Tull. Tuscul. lib. 5. and Philip Comines of Lewis the Eleventh.

prevent all probabilities of danger from men. Yet was this check of conscience[f], or this unknown doom or censure, (which conscience, whilst it checked the
389 hearts of wicked men, did so much fear,) so universal and constant, that Epicurus, a man of no scrupulous conscience, did observe it to be implanted by nature in all; and upon this observation did ground his former general principle, that nature herself did abhor or detest wickedness. The suggestion then or intimation of a future judgment was natural; but the apprehension or construction which Epicurus made of these suggestions, was but such as ordinary men make of representations in natural dreams, before they be throughly awaked, or before they consult the philosopher or physician. The Christian truth, which nature in these heathens (being, in respect of any supernatural use or end of her own suggestions, altogether dumb) did seek by these signs or intimations to express, was that lesson which the Author of nature and great Physician of our souls hath expressly taught us: *Fear not them, which after they have killed the body can do no more: but fear him who is able to cast both body and soul into hell fire; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.* Matt. x. 28. Luke xii. 4, 5.

14. As the wicked amongst the heathens could not by any earthly guard or greatness exempt themselves from that dread and fear, which their corrupt consciences did internally suggest; so that confident boldness, which the integrity of conscience doth naturally suggest unto every man in his laudable actions, was sometimes represented by the more civil and sober sort of heathens after a manner more magnificent, and in a measure more ample, than it usually is by

[f] See Wisd. xvii. 11. See Juvenal, Sat. xiii.

most Christians: their expressions or conceits of such confidence as integrity of conscience doth arm men withal, did as far exceed our ordinary apprehensions of it, as the representations of natural causes working within us, which are made unto us in sleep or dreams, do our waking apprehensions of the like workings or suggestions of nature. *Si fractus illabatur orbis*, saith Horace, a professed disciple of Epicurus, Carm. lib. 3. ode 3. v. 7, *impavidum ferient ruinæ*—"Albeit the heavens should rend asunder above his head, and this inferior world break in pieces about his ears, yet a man of an entire and sound conscience would stand unmoved, unaffrighted, like a pillar of brass or marble, when the roof which it supporteth were blown away or fallen from it[g]." This hyperbolical expression of that confidence which integrity of conscience in some measure always affords, was in this heathen (if he had been put upon the trial) but as the representation of a man's bodily estate made in a dream, whose true cause is unknown unto the dreamer. As in men that dream, so in this heathen poet, the apprehension of that which nature did truly and really suggest is most full and lively; but full and lively in both, without judgment, without true use or right application. That confidence then is the companion of a good conscience is a truth implanted by nature, and freely acknowledged by the oppugners of Divine Providence. But from what original or fountain this truth should issue, or to what comfortable use it might serve, were points which nature could not distinctly teach, or points at least which the mere natural man, without help of scriptures, or instructions from those heavenly physicians of the soul whom God hath appointed interpreters of

[g] . . . . Hic murus aheneus esto,
Nil conscire sibi— *Hor.* Epp. I. i. 60.

this book of life, could not learn: but we Christians know and believe, that when the heavens shall be gathered as a scroll, when the elements shall melt with heat, and when the earth shall be removed out of his place, that even in the midst of these terrible spectacles, such as have their consciences purified by faith shall lift up their heads for joy, as knowing these and the like to be undoubted prognostics or forerunning signs of their redemption drawing nigh unto them. A crisis (rather a kind of firstfruits) of this holy confidence was most remarkably attested to have been in the primitive Christians. So Antoninus the emperor (as in our 1st book, ch. 24, vol. i. p. 189, out of Eusebius' 4th book of Hist. Eccles. ch. 13, we did observe) did report of them to the Asiatics, who slandered and persecuted them: "Take notice," saith he, "of the late and daily earthquakes, compare our estate with theirs; they" (he means Christians) "have more confidence to Godward than you have."

Psalm iii. 6. Ps. xxiii. 4. Ps. xxvii. 1. Ps. xlvi. 1. Proverbs xxviii. 1. Wisd. v. 1.

390

15. This was the solid truth, whose lifeless lineaments, or obscure picture, nature had drawn unto the heathen in the former indefinite notions or suggestions: the best fruits of a good conscience, the principal end why we are to study and labour for the preservation of our consciences, void of offence towards God and man, throughout the whole course of our life, is, that we may be enabled in that last day to stand without horror or confusion before the Son of man. As peace of conscience breedeth confidence, so the only fountain whence this peace of conscience can issue, must be our reconciliation to that supreme Judge, whose doom or censure the consciences of mere natural men, implicitly or by instinct of nature, dread; albeit they cannot apprehend the express manner of the judgment to come, or who it is that shall be judge: both these, and all like points,

which are necessary unto true Christian faith, must be learned out of the book of life.

Thus much of the first general, viz., heathen notions of a judgment to come, &c.: we proceed to the second, according to the method proposed in the ninth chapter.

CHAP. XI.

By what Authority of Scripture the Exercise of this final Judgment is appropriated unto our Lord Jesus Christ.

1. THAT there was to be a judgment general to all, but most terrible to the wicked and ungodly, was a truth revealed before any part of the sacred books now extant were written: but if it be a revelation more ancient than the written canon, what warrant can we have to believe it besides tradition? Is then tradition a sufficient warrant for us to believe unwritten verities, or revelations made to God's saints for many thousand years ago? It is not, unless the tradition be expressly avouched by some canonical writer; but then it, or rather the voucher's authority concerning the truth of the tradition, is to be believed; so that our belief in this point must be resolved into a written verity, or a parcel of canonical scripture.

That there was to be a judgment, was known to the original world.

The revelation concerning the final judgment, whereof we now speak, was made to Enoch before the flood: the avoucher of this revelation is St. Jude, vv. 14, 15: *And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.* Besides

It was foretold by Enoch.

the authority of St. Jude, which makes this tradition to be no more a mere tradition, but canonical scripture, we have other more special grounds to believe that Enoch did thus prophesy, than we have to believe any other pretended revelations which are not contained in scripture.

The truth and certainty of this judgment denounced by Enoch was so publicly and notoriously
391 known, that the Hebrew church, before our Saviour's incarnation, did begin the writ or instrument of their great and terrible excommunication with the first words of Enoch's prophecy, *Dominus veniet*, "The Lord shall come[h]:" as if they meant to bind the party whom they excommunicated (besides all other punishments or infamies) over to this grand assize. But is there in this prophecy any particular character of Christ? any pregnant intimation that this great Judge of the world should be the second Person in the Trinity, rather than the first? In the words themselves there is no peculiar character of Christ, save only in the title *Lord*, which (as we said before) is peculiar to Christ, whether it be in the original expressed by the word *Jehovah* or *Adonai*, whensoever judgment, or visible exercise of jurisdiction regal, is the subject or matter of the prophetical discourse, as in this prophecy of Enoch it is. Besides this character in the words of the prophecy, the prophet himself, Enoch, was a lively type of Christ the great Prophet in the very ground of his title to *lordship* and *jurisdiction*. *Enoch was translated that he should not see death; but before his translation had this testimony, that he pleased God.* Heb. xi. 5. Before his translation, he denounced this wo, or curse, against all that continue in ungodliness, fore-

Enoch a lively type of Christ.

[h] See book 10. chap. 38. num. 11. [vol. ix. pag. 346.]

warning the world withal, that the Lord himself, whose ambassador he was, should come to put his embassage in execution. The congruity of the fact or type with the body foreshadowed, implies, that this prophecy was then to be fulfilled after the Prince of prophets had been translated, as Enoch was, from earth (but in an higher degree than Enoch was) into heaven itself: and albeit before his translation he had a more ample testimony than Enoch had, (*This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased,*) yet was he not made *Lord* and *King* and *Judge* till after his resurrection and translation. From that time, the angels and principalities and powers, even all the host of heaven, intimated by Enoch, became (by that title) subject unto him. That Christ is that very Lord against whom those ungodly men whom Enoch mentions did speak such bitter words, our apostle St. Paul, though obscurely, yet fully, implies, in the conclusion of his First Epistle to the Corinthians, chap. xvi. 22: *If any man love not the Lord Jesus, let him be Anathema* Μαρὰν ἀθὰ, that is, let him be accursed or excommunicated with that great and terrible excommunication Μαρὰν ἀθὰ, that is, *The Lord shall come;* for so they call their *excommunication*, as we do *writs*, by the first words of the writ or instrument; and these were the first words of Enoch's prophecy, *Veniet Dominus*, "The Lord shall come." The full meaning or implication of the apostle is, that whosoever doth not love the Lord Jesus shall be liable to all the judgments or woes denounced by Enoch against the hard speeches of ungodly sinners which they have spoken against their Lord and Judge.

2. That God is Judge of all the earth, that there shall be a final judgment generally awarded to all the inhabitants of the earth by God himself, the places of

Testimonies of the Old Testament, that God, that Christ, shall be Judge.

the Old Testament are infinite. I shall only touch the principal or more pregnant testimonies to this purpose. To begin with the first, Gen. xviii. 22, 23: When *the men turned their faces from thence, and went towards Sodom, Abraham stood yet before the Lord. And drawing near, he said, Wilt thou also destroy the righteous with the wicked?* And again, ver. 25: *To slay the righteous with the wicked, and that the righteous should be as the wicked, that be far from thee: Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?* Thus he spake in the case of Sodom, whose judgment this Lord and Judge of all the earth was then ready to put in execution. Now this judgment of Sodom was but as a private and particular sessions,
392 to give the world an undoubted pledge of that general and terrible judgment, which must be given upon all such as they were, by the same Lord's visible appearance, before whom Abraham did now appear as advocate or intercessor for these men of Sodom. So St. Jude instructs us, vv. 6, 7: *And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Even as Sodom and Gomorrha, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.* There were three in number which then appeared unto Abraham under the shape and likeness of men; yet to his apprehension more than men, angels of the Lord, or the Lord himself in a Trinity of angels, representing the blessed Trinity; in which, as Athanasius tells us, there are "not three Lords, but one Lord;" yet, though there be but one Lord Jehovah, and though the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be this one Lord, yet (as we

said, chap. 6, 7.) the Son of God is *Adonai*, or Κύριος, *the Lord* or *Judge*, by peculiar title[i]; and by such personal right, as God the Father, and God the Holy Ghost, is not Lord and Judge: and for this reason, albeit there were three that appeared to Abraham, yet Abraham directs his speech unto one, as unto his Lord; and this *Lord* did vouchsafe his answer unto Abraham, after the men which appeared unto him turned their faces thence, and went towards Sodom.

Other testimonies to this purpose are most frequent in the book of Psalms; psalm l. 1, 2, 3: *The mighty God, even the Lord, hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun unto the going down thereof. Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty, God hath shined. Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him.* And ver. 6: *And the heavens shall declare his righteousness: for God is judge himself.* Psalm xciii. 1, 2: *The Lord reigneth, he is clothed with majesty; the Lord is clothed with strength, wherewith he hath girded himself: the world also is stablished, that it cannot be moved. Thy throne is established of old: thou art from everlasting.* Every throne or tribunal is established for execution of judgment: but this throne, though established of old, or from eternity, yet was not the judgment for which this throne was established executed from eternity, or so executed at any time before the date of this psalm, as the psalmist expected in due time or at the end of time it would be. And the author of the next psalm (whether the same or some other) conceives a solemn prayer for the speedy execution of that judgment, which was to proceed from the former throne, which had been

[i] See book 7. chap. 36. [vol. vii. p. 363.]

established from everlasting, and to be executed by that God, to whose honour the former psalm was consecrated. *O Lord God*, saith the psalmist, ps. xciv. 1—4, *to whom vengeance belongeth; O God, to whom vengeance belongeth, shew thyself. Lift up thyself, thou judge of the earth: render a reward to the proud. Lord, how long shall the wicked, how long shall the wicked triumph? How long shall they utter and speak hard things? and all the workers of iniquity boast themselves?* To omit other testimonies to the like purpose, this one observation is general to all: As the Messias who was first promised, and but promised only, to Adam, was afterwards promised by oath to Abraham, and to David, and by them to all mankind; so this future general judgment, which was first revealed, for aught we read, to Enoch, afterwards known to Abraham, and to David, and to the psalmists, (were they one or more,) was afterwards confirmed by the oath of God himself unto the prophet Isaiah, chap. xlv. 22, 23: *Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else. I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, That unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.*

It was revealed by degrees, that Christ should be Judge.

393

3. All these testimonies are concludent, that God is Judge of all the earth, and that there shall be a final judgment executed by God himself. But the point wherein the reader (as I suppose) expects satisfaction, is, from what authentic testimony of scripture it is, or may be made as clear and evident, that this final judgment shall be personally executed by the Son of God, or by the man Christ Jesus. As much as to this purpose can be required is avouched by our apostle St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 11: *It is written, As I live, saith*

the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. The written testimony which he avoucheth is that before last cited, Isaiah xlv. 23. And from this testimony he infers these two conclusions: the former, ver. 10, (which is the same with 2 Cor. v. 10,) *We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ;* the latter, ver. 12, *So then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God.* The issue or corollary of both conclusions is, that Jesus Christ is that Lord and God which had interposed his oath unto the prophet Isaiah, *that every knee should bow unto him.* This issue of both conclusions, Rom. xiv. is more fully expressed, Phil. ii. 9—11: *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of* Jesus *every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.*

Two conclusions, one corollary.

But for more full satisfaction, some here may justly demand, whether St. Paul did make this interpretation of the prophet Isaiah by some new revelation of the Spirit made in particular to him, unknown to most others before that time? or whether the interpretation of the prophet Isaiah, and of other like prophecies which he made, were literally and really included in the prophecies themselves, and ratified by the general analogy of faith, or by the common rule of interpretation in those times sufficiently known to the learned, whose eyes were not blinded with passion, nor prejudiced with partiality to their own sects or factions?

To this we answer, that St. Paul's interpretation of the prophet was really included in the literal sense of the prophecy, and the literal sense or construction,

which he made of the forecited passage in the prophet Isaiah, and other prophets, was warrantable by the common rule of interpretation sufficiently known in those times.

An useful general rule.

The rule is general, that all those places of the Old Testament, which intimate either a new manner of God's governing the world, or a beginning of his reign over all nations, or of being made Lord and King, or of arising to judge the earth, must be meant of God incarnate, that is, of the Son of God begotten before all worlds, and begotten again from the dead. For as the Son of God by his death and resurrection became our Lord by a peculiar title, so he was from the ground of the same title appointed Judge of quick and dead by a peculiar and personal right. This is more often and more emphatically intimated by our Saviour Christ, and by his apostles, than observed by many of their professed interpreters. First by St. Peter, Acts x. 40—42: *Him God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.* 394 *And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.* And again by St. Paul, Acts xvii. 30, 31: *And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.* But more fully by the same St. Paul, Rom. xiv. 9: *To this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living.* In this collection

from the prophet Isaiah, he saith no more than our Saviour hath done, John v. 21, 22: *For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.*

4. But the former question still revolves upon the same centre that it did before. The point or centre is this: Whether St. Peter or St. Paul, or whether our Saviour himself, did deliver the doctrine forecited from that authority only which was delegated to them from God within that compass of time wherein they did converse with men here on earth; or whether the doctrine which they then delivered were fully ratified by divine authority revealed and written before? To this we answer, that our Saviour himself, in all his answers to the Jews, did but comment upon or expound those texts of holy scripture which he had put into his prophets' mouths long before he himself had spoken with the mouth of man. One of the most pregnant texts of the Old Testament is psalm lxxxii. 1, 2, &c.: *God standeth in the congregation of the mighty; he judgeth among the gods. How long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked? I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High. But ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes:* that is, like any princes amongst the heathen: and dying and falling thus, they could not expect that they were to rise again to judge others, but rather to be judged by God himself, or by him that was the Son of the Most High in another manner than they were; who, though he were to die as man, yet did he not cease to be the Son of God by his death; yea, he was declared *to be the* only *Son of God with power, by his resurrection from the dead.*

Christ's answers to the Jews were but comments upon the prophets.

And out of this hope of his future resurrection, the psalmist for conclusion, being as it seems oppressed with corruption of judgment, appeals unto the supreme Judge, as well of the dead as of the living: *Arise, O God, judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations*, ver. 8. He doth not say, *thou dost inherit all nations*, or *thou art already set in judgment;* but, *Arise, O God, judge the earth: for thou shalt inherit all nations.* So that the ground or title of his universal jurisdiction or judicature is his inheritance of all nations, and his title of inheritance over all nations bears date, or began to be *in esse*, from the day of his resurrection; as you heard before out of St. Paul, Rom. xiv, and was before him expressly foretold by the prophet David, psalm ii. 7, 8, 9: *I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel.* This decree was executed, this promise performed, when all power in heaven and earth was given unto Christ, Matt. xxviii. 18.

5. To omit all further variety of testimonies, no
395 other article in our Creed is or can be so authenticly testified as this one article of Christ's coming to judgment is. Besides that it was expressly and distinctly foretold by the prophets, and the fulfilling of their prophecies expressly avouched by the evangelists and the apostles, the truth of it was in special manner sealed by the blood of this great Judge himself. The only matter of death which the malicious wit of his enemies could invent or pretend against him, was from his voluntary confession of this article, in the same

form or terms wherein we profess our belief of it. For, as you may read, Matt. xxvi. 59, after the high priest and elders had found that the witnesses subborned against him did not agree in their testimonies, or else (which is more probable) that their testimonies, though well agreeing, did not amount to any matter capital, the high priest seeks to entangle him in his own answers to this interrogatory: *I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God,* ver. 63. Our Saviour confesseth the article or interrogatory; for so much is answered, at least, in the next words: *Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.*

A main branch of that *good confession* which Christ witnessed, was, his title to be Judge.

This adversative particle *nevertheless* hath much troubled some interpreters; and some, to ease themselves of further trouble, would have it be no adversative, but an affirmative: as to their apprehensions the Hebrew *ac* (whereof the Greek πλὴν in this place is the expression) in many places of the Old Testament is an affirmative, no adversative particle.

The adversative particle *nevertheless.*

But it were easy to shew them wherein their observations fail. The difficulty of the construction in this place may be two ways salved; either, 1, by filling up this hiatus or chink in St. Matthew with the words of our Saviour's answer which St. Luke relates; or, 2, by borrowing this adversative particle from St. Matthew, and adding it unto St. Luke's relation.

Unto the former question, *Art thou the Christ?* our Saviour in the morning answered, *If I tell you, ye will not believe,* Luke xxii. 67. And it is probable our Saviour's words, related by St. Matthew, *Thou sayest it,* include as much as if he had said, "Thy

conscience tells thee, though thou wilt not hearken to it, nor believe it, that I am Christ the Son of God; but howsoever you will not now believe it, nevertheless hereafter you shall be enforced to acknowledge it. Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." *Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses?* Indeed, if the matter which he confessed had been truly capital, his own confession, being made before a competent judge, had been a sufficient and full conviction without any further witness. But there was nothing in his answer which according to these high priests' rules or principles could bear so much as the least colour or appearance of any crime, much less of blasphemy, unless their hearts had been infected with malice against his person.

The blasphemous and treacherous Jews condemn Christ of treason and blasphemy.

They now condemn him of blasphemy in their own court, and yet immediately after they accuse him of treason in the Roman court, for saying he was the King of the Jews: their accusation in both was so grossly malicious, that it did plainly reverberate or reflect upon themselves; for if to be king of the Jews were treason against the Roman state, then the high priests and elders with all their complices were traitors; because they expected their Messias to be a temporal
396 king, greater than Cæsar. But such is their malice against Jesus of Nazareth, that rather than he should be acknowledged for their Messias, they would make their Messias a traitor, and their own doctrine concerning him to be treason. Rather than they will acknowledge Jesus of Nazareth to be the Son of God, or the Son of man appointed to be the Judge of quick and dead, they will make their Messias to be a blasphemer, and the prophets' doctrine concerning his

personal office to be blasphemy: for if the veil of malice had been removed from their hearts, or if they had not looked upon our Saviour's answer through it, there is no branch or part of this answer which was not distinctly and expressly foretold by the prophets: as, that their expected Messias should be both the Son of God and the Son of man, and the Judge of all the earth; first, David had said of their Messias, *Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool*, psalm cx. 1. Here was the seat of his judgment prepared at the right hand of power. His coming likewise in the clouds as *the Son of man* to *the Ancient of days*, to receive this power and jurisdiction, is expressly foretold by Daniel, chap. vii. 13. And was it not now full time that God, as the psalmist before had prayed, psalm lxxxii. 8, should *arise to judge the earth*, whenas malice had so far perverted the judgment of the children of God, of Moses and Aaron's successors, that they had adjudged the Son of God to death for avouching himself to be the Judge of the quick and the dead.

The application.

6. The particular duties whereunto the belief of this article doth unpartially bind all, may be pressed upon the soul of the reader with better opportunity, when we come unto the latter general branches proposed, viz. the process or sentence. The most general fruit which this second branch affords, is comfort in oppression, or when judgment either publicly or in our own particular is perverted.

Tully, that famous orator and great statesman, seeing his country laws and privileges overthrown, and his country brought into slavery by Augustus, writes unto the emperor, that he for his part would leave this world, and prefer a complaint against him unto the Decii and Curii, ancient Romans which had

laid down their lives for the liberty of their country long before. Thus to desire rather to die, than to behold the evil which was likely to befall that goodly and flourishing commonweal, was not amiss, not (in itself) unchristian. For so God in mercy takes away good and merciful men before he begins to execute his severe and public judgments upon any land, lest they should see the evil to come. And out of the strength of this good desire perhaps it was that Tully, albeit he had been noted for timorousness in his prosperity, did entertain a violent death with manly and Christian-like courage. But, alas! what a miserable comfort was it which he could hope for from Decius or Curius, or from any of his deceased predecessors, whom he knew not where or in what estate to find! With what constancy and patience would this man have maintained a just cause, specially his country's right, whether by living or dying, if his heart had been fraught with belief or hopes of finding so wise, so gracious, so upright and powerful a Judge, as we acknowledge Christ Jesus the Son of God to be! If he be for us, what can be against us? If he be pleased to heal us, what wounds can hurt us? If he acquits us, what sentence or condemnation can prejudice us? The heathen poet and Epicurean philosopher had observed,

> Integer vitæ scelerisque purus
> Non eget Mauris jaculis, neque arcu, &c.
>
> *Hor.* Carm. I. xxii. 1, 2.

397 that there could be no weapons, whether offensive or defensive, so useful as integrity of life and soundness of conscience: he that was thus armed, needed no other armour or weapons. This was but a dreaming apprehension of that confidence which our apostle deduceth from its true original, Rom. viii. 31—37: *In all these things we are more than conquerors.*

7. I know a great many ready to derive this confidence from the doctrine of election or predestination. I do not herein dissent from them: and I could wish they would not herein dissent from me; but think, that "their persuasions of their own election and predestination are but vain, merely Jewish, unless in all their troubles and oppressions they become like unto their supreme Judge in these two points: first, in the integrity or uprightness of the cause for which they suffer oppressions or grievances; secondly, in suffering grievances, though openly wrongful, with meekness and patience[k]." A lesson most necessary for these times, though hard to learn in this and neighbour places; many (I dare not say all, or most part) of whose inhabitants are of that disposition and education, that they neither know how to entertain wholesome justice or government with that obedience and respect which they owe unto it; nor can brook any injustice or error in judgment, though executed by their lawful magistrates or superiors, without intemperate speeches, undecent opposition, or unmannerly censure. Yet, let me tell them, that this proneness to speak evil of dignities and dominions, whether ecclesiastic or temporal, is one of those grievous sins, whereof, as St. Jude intimates, the supreme Judge will take special notice in that day; and the harbourers of it, without repentance, shall have a large portion of the wo or curse denounced by Enoch: there is no sin for its quality more opposite to justice, or that can more provoke a just and gracious judge, than intrusion into his office without warrant or commission; and yet so they all do, that without warrant will become magistrates, or censurers, or judges of

[k] It is likely this was preached at Newcastle, where he was vicar divers years.

others. Such as affect the name of *zealous professors* in our times cannot more directly impeach themselves of gross hypocrisy, than by nursing this censuring humour in themselves, or applauding it in others, whilst they profess to believe this article of appearing before the judgment seat of Christ; the belief whereof, were it true or sound, would not suffer this censorious humour, of all others whatsoever, to lodge in the same breast with it, as being most directly opposite unto it, most incompatible with it.

Nor did our apostle St. Paul himself know any other medicine, or possible cure of this malady, than the pressing this article upon such as were tainted with it: *Who art thou*, saith he, Rom. xiv. 4, *that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth:* what more would you have said (or have left unsaid) to such as take upon them to judge or censure their lawful magistrates and pastors? And again, ver. 10: *Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? seeing we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ:* and, ver. 12: *So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.* As for the magistrate or such as have taken the charge of souls upon them, they must give an account to God, not of themselves only, but of others committed to their charge; but their flock or inferiors are not bound to give account of them; and for this reason should in conscience be more ready to be directed or censured by them, than to direct or judge their actions.

8. The former point might pass without further addition or annotation, were it not that a late divine,
398 of deserved note, seems to deny the place avouched, Dan. vii. 13, to be literally meant of a final judgment;

of which if it were not literally meant, our Saviour's allegation of it was not concludent; nor should the conviction of the high priest, for giving wrong judgment upon our Saviour, be so notorious and manifest as we suppose it to be, and at the last day it will appear: the prejudice of one modern divine's authority in a negative of this nature cannot be great, especially seeing this negation is grounded only upon an inconsiderate or careless inference: "This place of Daniel," saith he, "is literally meant of Christ's ascending to his Father, and of his investiture in the kingdom of heaven." This no man denies. And necessary it was that he should ascend into heaven, and be established in his throne, before he came to the accomplishment of jurisdiction royal: such is the exercise or execution of final judgment. The argument then will hold much better affirmatively than negatively: 'The forecited place of Daniel is literally meant of Christ's ascension and inthronization; *ergo*, it is principally meant of the execution of final judgment, of such a judgment as is to reverse or rectify whatsoever hath been wrongfully done or adjudged by the most potent monarchs or supreme tribunals of the earth.' So it is expressly foretold, Dan. ii. 44, 45, that this kingdom, whereof the Son of man did take possession, should destroy or break in pieces the Babylonian, the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman monarchy, with all their appurtenances and attendances, or relics: *And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and*

The literal meaning of Dan. vii. 13. inquired.

that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure.

To omit all question, how Christ's kingdom here foretold, being not erected till the Roman monarchy was at the height, should destroy the Babylonian, the Persian, or the Macedonian monarchy, all which three were in the wane before the Roman was crescent, certain it is, that the Roman monarchy being at the height when Christ ascended, was to be destroyed by him, yet not destroyed at his ascension. The case then is clear, that the forementioned prophecy of Daniel cannot be terminated by the time of our Saviour's ascension, but is to be extended to all succeeding ages, yea after time shall be no more. If the kingdom, whereof Christ at his ascension took possession, be for duration everlasting, for power most sovereign, so absolute and independent, that all other kingdoms which have been, are, or shall be, depend on it, and are responsible to it, the execution of all judgment, whether past or to come, whether temporal or eternal, must either be ratified or reversed, or immediately awarded by this everlasting King.

Polanus' restriction of Dan. vii. 13. to Christ's ascension.

Polanus himself (the principal author or abettor of the former opinion, viz., that the place of Daniel, vii. 13, is not literally meant of Christ's coming to judgment) grants, that the kingdom, whereof Christ at his ascension took possession, shall be consummate in the life to come, and not before; and in granting thus much, he is concluded to grant withal, that the former places are principally or consummately meant of Christ's coming to judge the world, and to translate the king-

dom of God begun here on earth, into the heaven of heavens; in which, so translated, all shall be kings—all shall be judges—all shall be perpetual laws unto themselves; there shall be no place for after-judgment, especially for any sentence of condemnation.

9. To let the former misinterpretation of the pro- 399
phet Daniel pass as a private error, or oversight rather, which wants the general consent, as well of the Roman church as of the reformed, it is now (God be praised) on all hands agreed on, and acknowledged by the best learned of both churches, that many places of the Old Testament are literally and truly meant both of Christ's first coming in humility to be judged of men, and of his second coming in glory to give judgment upon the world: and not of these two periods of times only, but of all the times intermediate or interjacent: howbeit, of these times only *inchoativè*, consummately, finally, or punctually of the life to come, which takes beginning from the last judgment. That this place of Dan. vii. is *inchoativè* meant of Christ's first coming, that is, that it first began literally to be verified then, but shall not be consummated or fulfilled until the last judgment, or in the life to come, is acknowledged and well observed by a late learned Jesuit: and this interpretation being proffered by a man of that profession, I entertain the rather, because it affords us a facile and commodious interpretation of all or most of those places (whether in the Old Testament or in the New) which the Romish church, the Jesuits in special, insist upon, for the glorious prerogatives of the visible church, and of the visible Roman church above all churches visible.

One prophecy may in the literal sense have two verifications; yea, contrary senses, book 7. chap. 17. vol. vii. [p. 120.]

How many instances soever or places they bring, whether general for the visible or militant church, or for the glory of the Roman church in special, this one

An answer to all texts brought for the Roman church's great glory; by distinction, *inchoativè* and *completivè*.

answer will give satisfaction to all; "They are meant of the visible or militant church *inchoativè*, but of the church triumphant *consummativè;* they are meant of the visible or militant church indefinitely; that is, some particular members of the visible church have undoubted pledges or earnests of those glorious promises in this life, which notwithstanding shall not be either universally, punctually, or solidly accomplished, save only in the members of the church triumphant."

Christ's church (whether we consider it as militant or triumphant) is an essential or integral part of his kingdom; and as his kingdom, so his church hath its first plantation or beginning here on earth; both have a right or interest in the glorious promises made to the church universal; neither church nor kingdom here on earth can have entire possession of the blessings or prerogatives promised, until it be given them by the great King at the day of final judgment. Of this rank is that prophecy, Jer. xxxi. 34: *And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.* This place (no man denies) was literally verified in the effusion of the Holy Ghost upon our Saviour's ascension; but shall not be punctually and solidly fulfilled until the day of judgment be past[m]: then the true members of Christ's church shall neither need tradition nor the written word; they shall be all immediately taught of God, and have his laws most perfectly and indelibly written in their hearts. The gates of hell shall not then in any wise prevail against them, not so far as to annoy their bodies or interrupt

An exposition of Jer. xxxi. 34.

[m] See chap. 12. sect. 8. [p. 205. of this volume.]

their peace and happiness. Of this entire happiness and perfection the church militant had a pledge or earnest in the effusion of the Holy Ghost, and all that be true members of Christ's church have a superficial draught or picture of this entire happiness in their hearts. But Christ at his ascension was so far from annulling the use of preaching or teaching one another, that, as the apostle tells us, Eph. iv. 11—13, *He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evan-* 400
gelists; and some, pastors and teachers; (more extraordinary than any had been during the time of the law;) *for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith,* &c.

10. Thus to interpret the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the church, indefinitely taken, can be no paradox, seeing the predictions of our Saviour himself concerning his kingdom must of necessity be thus interpreted; witness that prediction, (to omit others,) Matt. xvi. 27, 28: *The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, that shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.*

The latter part of this prediction, or the experiment answering unto it, was exemplified in Peter, James, and John, within seven days after: for these three were spectators of his transfiguration in the mount; and his transfiguration was but a representation or exemplification of that glory wherein he shall appear in the day of judgment, when he shall give these apostles, and all that shall obey his precepts, full possession of the kingdom of God prepared for them. But albeit these three apostles had not only their eyes but their

ears true witnesses of his glory, *as of the glory of the only begotten Son of God*—for so it is said, Matt. xvii. 2, *His face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light:* and, ver. 5: *A bright cloud overshadowed them: and behold a voice out of the cloud, which said, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him*—yet miserable men had they been for all this, if their hopes or expectations had been terminated or accomplished with this transient glorious spectacle or voice: both the voice and the spectacle were but earnests or pledges of that everlasting joy or happiness, which they were to expect in the perpetual fruition of the like sights or sounds in the life to come.

Of this sort or rank is that prophecy of Isaiah ii. 4: *And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.* There was at the birth of that great Judge a glimpse exhibited of this universal peace, which shall not be universally established before the last and final judgment: all the nations of the earth were quiet, and free from any noise of war, when he came first into the world, for Janus's temple was then shut; and after he shall be revealed again unto the world from heaven, there shall be neither death, nor famine, nor the sword. Howbeit, even the dearest of his saints, which have lived since his first birth, were to endure a perpetual war in their pilgrimage here on earth; and the end of their war is to make them capable of this everlasting peace.

11. Another prediction of his coming to judgment there is, which must be interpreted according to the

former rule; that is, *inchoativè*, or in part of his first coming to visit us in humility and to instruct the world; but *completivè*, or fully, of his second coming to judge the world, Mal. iii. 2, 3: *But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fullers' sope: and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.*

Mal. iii. 2. meant *inchoativè* of Christ's first coming, *completivè* of his second.

So certain and so general is the former rule of interpretation, that not this prediction of Malachi's only, and the like of other prophets, but the fulfilling of them 401
related by the evangelists, cannot rightly be interpreted without the help of this rule: for instance, to lay this rule unto St. John Baptist's speech, Matt. iii. 10—12: *Now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will throughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.* This prediction cannot be exactly fulfilled until the final sentence be given and put in execution: and yet within forty-three years after his baptism by John, there was a manifest and lively representation exhibited to the world of his second coming unto judgment; and this representation was exhibited upon the nation of the Jews: the full accomplishment whereof shall at his second coming (and not before) be universally and exactly accomplished in all nations, and languages,

and people: wherein then doth this representation of final judgment, which at his first coming[m] was exhibited in the Jewish nation, punctually consist? In this especially: "There was such a notorious and manifest crisis or distinction between the elect and reprobate of the Jewish nation, or seed of Abraham, at his first coming, as in no nation or people had been experienced before, nor shall be experienced in any before the day of final judgment, in which this distinction of elect and reprobates shall not be only universally manifested, but solemnly declared in respect of all mankind: every son of Adam shall in that day be irrevocably marshalled or ranked, either amongst the absolute reprobates, or absolute elect: in the one or other rank of which estates, neither all nor most of every nation or church are at all points of time in the interim to be accounted, no not in respect of God's eternal decree[n]:" nor may the verdicts or aphorisms, whether of our Saviour himself, or of his apostles after his death, concerning election or reprobation, be extended to other times or nations in the same measure or tenor, wherein they were verified and experienced in the nation of the Jews, at or upon our Saviour's first coming. Thus far to extend them, in respect of all times or nations, were to transgress the analogy of faith, or received rules of interpreting scriptures, and to dissolve the sweet and pleasant harmony between the law and the gospel, or between the evangelists and the prophets.

Such a discrimination of elect and reprobate, as was then, may not be looked for till doomsday.

And thus far of the second point; in handling whereof divers passages have intruded themselves which are not impertinent to the third point.

[m] By *first coming*, he means his coming to judge and punish the Jews: the coming spoken of John xxi. 22.

[n] See book 10. chap. 37, 38, [vol. ix. pp. 296, 332.]

CHAP. XII.

Of the Manner of Christ's Coming to Judgment, which was the third general proposed in the ninth Chapter.

1. It is said in the former prophecy of Daniel, chap. vii. 13, that *one like the Son of man came in the clouds of heaven unto the Ancient of days.* The literal fulfilling of this prophetical vision is recorded, Acts i. 9: *And when he* (to wit, Christ, the Son of man) *had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight:* but whither he was carried in the cloud which received him, they could not distinctly see: their bodily eyes could not see so much by day, as had been revealed to Daniel in vision by night. But admit that this cloud did carry him into the presence of the Ancient of days, or of God his Father, what is this manner of his going into heaven, unto the manner of his coming to judge the earth, which is the point in hand? Certainly much; for so the angels, ver. 11, admonished his disciples, which steadfastly beheld the manner of his ascension: *Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.* But shall the manner of his coming to judge the world be in every point like unto the manner of his ascending into heaven? No; then it should not be so terrible as we believe it shall be The chief parts then of this similitude are these two:

Dan. vii. 13. fulfilled, Acts i. 9.

402

The first, As he did locally and visibly go into heaven, so he shall locally and visibly come to judge the earth.

The manner of Christ's going up to heaven, shewed the manner of

The second, As he was received into heaven in a

his coming to judge the earth.

cloud, so he shall come to judge the world (as he himself foretold the high priest and his complices, Matt. xxvi. 64.) *in the clouds of heaven.*

The literal meaning of both places, and the intent and purpose, as well of the angels as of our Saviour in this prediction, infers, that this Son of man, whom they now beheld with bodily eyes, was that very God, whose glorious kingdom and reign the psalmist describes, psalm civ. 3, &c.: *Who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters: who maketh the clouds his chariot: who walketh upon the wings of the wind: who maketh his angels spirits* (or *the spirits his angels*), *his ministers a flaming fire.* So they will appear when they attend him coming to judgment, which will be in flaming fire.

In all the manifestations of Christ to be the Son of God, the cloud is still a witness.

First, in his transfiguration upon the mount *a cloud did overshadow him;* and out of the cloud this testimony was given him by God the Father, Matt. xvii. 5: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.*

2. Whilst he ascends to God his Father, Acts i. 9, *a cloud receives him.*

And, 3, when he shall come from heaven, or from his Father's presence, to judge the earth, he shall have a cloud for his canopy.

The place or term from which Christ shall come to judgment.

For more particular description of the manner of his coming, the next point is, from what place he shall come. Now it is expressly said in our Creed, " that Christ Jesus our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, descended into hell; who the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, and there sitteth at the right

hand of God; shall thence come to judge the quick and the dead." But this word, *thence*, is of ambiguous reference: it may be referred in general either to the heavens, into which he ascended, or unto the right hand of God, or unto both. Certain it is, that he shall come from heaven as visibly and locally as he ascended thither. Yet whether he shall come from the right hand of God is questionable, but not by us determinable, unless it be determined already in the first chapter of this book, what is literally meant by *the right hand of God*, either in the Creed, or in those places of the New Testament out of which this article is taken. If Christ's body (as Lutherans did contend, ch. 3. sect. 6.) be every where; or, if by *the right hand of God* only the power of God be literally meant, as many other protestant writers take as granted, or leave unquestioned; then Christ cannot be said to come from the right hand of God; for it is impossible that Christ 403
should come, or that there should be any true motion from that which is every where. Neither can it be said, nor may it so much as be imagined, that Christ should depart from the power of God, which (wheresoever he be as man) doth accompany and guard him. But if by *the right hand of God*, at which Christ sitteth, be literally meant a visible and glorious throne, then Christ may be said as truly and locally to come from thence, as from heaven, to judge the quick and the dead: at least his throne may remove with him. Now that by *the right hand of God*, at which Christ sitteth, a visible or local throne is meant, I will at this time add only one testimony unto the rest heretofore avouched in the handling of that article, which is more literally concludent than all the rest; and it is Heb. xii. 2, *He endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the*

throne of God. Not *at the right hand of his own throne,* but *at the right hand of the throne of God* the Father.

To what place Christ (probably) shall come.

2. For perfecting this map or survey of Christ's coming to judgment, already begun, would it not be as pertinent to know the place unto which he shall come, as the place whence he comes? By the rules of art or method, this last question would be more pertinent than the former. But seeing the scriptures are not in this point so express and punctual as in the former, we may not so peremptorily determine it, or so curiously search into it. This is certain, that Christ after his descending from heaven, shall have his throne or seat of judgment placed between the heaven and the earth in the air overshadowed with clouds; but over what part of the earth his throne shall be thus placed, is uncertain or conjectural; at the most but probable.

Many notwithstanding, as well ancient as modern, are of opinion, that the throne or seat of judgment shall be placed over the mount of Olives, from which Christ did ascend; and this (for aught we have to say against it) may be a third branch of the forementioned similitude betwixt the manner of Christ's ascending up into heaven, and of his coming to judgment; that is, as he was received in a cloud into heaven over mount Olivet, so he shall descend in the clouds of heaven to judge the world in the same place. But the testimony of scripture, which gives the best ground of probability, and a tincture at least of moral certainty to the former opinion or conjecture, is that of Zech. xiv. 3, 4[o]: *Then shall the Lord go forth, and fight against those nations,* (to wit, all those nations which have been gathered in battle against Jerusalem,

[o] See book 9. chap. 43. [vol. viii. p. 495.]

and these in the verse precedent were *all nations,*) *as when he fought in the day of battle. And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east, and the mount of Olives shall cleave in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south,* &c. This place albeit (perhaps) in part it were verified in the destruction of Jerusalem, yet may it be also literally meant of the last general judgment, in which the rest of the prophecy following shall punctually and exactly be fulfilled.

3. But to leave these circumstances of place, from which and unto which Christ shall come, and utterly to omit the circumstance of time, which is more uncertain. The most useful branch of the third general point proposed, is, to know or apprehend the terrible manner of his coming: *Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord,* saith our apostle, 2 Cor. v. 11, *we persuade men.* His speech is very emphatical and significant; an aphorism of life, unto whose truth every experienced physician of the soul will 404
easily subscribe. For but a few men there be (especially in these later times, and these must be more than men, in some good measure Christian men) whom we can hope to persuade unto godliness by the love of God in Christ our Lord; albeit we should spend our brains in drawing the picture or proportion of the love exhibited in Christ, or give lustre or colour to the proportion drawn by the evangelists with our own blood. But by the terror of the Lord, or by deciphering of that last and dreadful day, we shall perhaps persuade some men to become Christians,

as well in heart as in profession, by taking Christ's death and their own lives into serious consideration.

Two senses chiefly apt to receive the impressions of terror: terrors of sounds and terrors of sights.

Now of terror or dread there be two corporeal senses more apprehensive than the rest, which are apt rather to suffer or feel than to dread the evils which befall them; the two inlets by which dread or terror enters into the soul of man are the eye and the ear. All the terrors of that last day may be reduced to these two heads: to the strange and unusual sights which shall then be seen, and unto the strange and unusual sounds or voices which shall then be heard. If we would search the sacred records from the fall of our first parents until our restauration was accomplished by Christ, or until the sacred canon was complete, the notifications or apprehensions of God's extraordinary presence, whether they were made by voice or spectacle unusual, have been fearful and terrible to flesh and blood, though much better acquainted with God's presence than we are.

When our first parents heard but *the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day, they hid themselves from his presence amongst the trees of the garden*, Gen. iii. 8. 10. *When Gideon*, Judges vi. 22, *perceived that he which had spoken unto him* (albeit he had spoken nothing but words of comfort and encouragement) *was the angel of the Lord, Gideon said, Alas, O Lord God! because I have seen an angel of the Lord face to face.* The issue of his fear was death, which haply he conceived from God's word to Moses, Exod. xxxiii. 20: *Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me, and live.* But to assure Gideon that he was not comprised under that universal sentence of death denounced by God himself to all that shall *see him face to face*, the

Lord saith unto him, ver. 23, 24, *Peace be unto thee; fear not: thou shalt not die.* And *Gideon* (for further ratification of this privilege or dispensation) *built an altar there unto the Lord, and called it Jehovah-shalom:* that is, *The Lord send peace;* or, *The Lord will be a Lord of peace unto his servants.* Yet could not this assurance, made by the Lord himself unto Gideon, exempt his successors from the like or greater fear upon notice of God's extraordinary presence. For so Manoah, (Samson's father,) after long conference with the Lord, after he knew that it was an angel of the Lord which had brought the message to him of Samson's birth, said unto his wife, Judges xiii. 22, *We shall surely die, because we have seen God. But his wife said unto him, If the Lord were pleased to kill us, he would not have received a burnt offering and a meat offering at our hands, neither would he have shewed us all these things, nor would as at this time have told us such things as these,* ver. 23. So then God's extraordinary presence is terrible even to his servants, to flesh and blood, without exception, though in the issue it will prove comfortable to such as truly fear him, and faithfully rely upon his promises. St. Peter, long after this time, was a man less conscious of many grievous sins than most of us alive this day are, yet not upon any sight or spectacle of God's extraordinary presence, but only upon an instinct or secret apprehension of his peculiar presence in Christ as man, notified unto him by the miraculous draught of fishes which he took by his direction and 405
command, cries out, *Lord, depart from me; for I am a sinful man.* Luke v. 8. And St. Paul, before his conversion, *fell to the earth* upon a sudden glimpse or representation of that glorious light wherein Christ shall appear at the last day, Acts ix. 3, 4. And after

he had heard *a voice saying unto him*, (though in no extraordinary manner for terror,) *Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?* he, trembling and astonished at the name of Jesus, said, *Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?* ver. 6. No marvel if St. Paul, being conscious of persecution intended by him against Christ's church, and having by fact and resolution declared himself to be Christ's enemy, were thus affrighted at the sight and voice; whenas St. Peter, St. James, and St. John, after long and peculiar familiarity with Christ, and after many gracious promises made unto them of God's special protection over them, were thrown down to the earth with a more placid and comfortable voice than that which St. Paul heard. The voice which they heard out of the cloud was this; *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him.* And when they heard it, (saith the text, Matt. xvii. 6,) *they fell on their face, and were sore afraid;* until Christ *came and touched them, and said, Arise, and be not afraid.* This strange dejection of these three great apostles at so mild and gentle a voice, yet a voice uttered from the extraordinary presence of God, gives us a remarkable document or grounded observation of the truth of that saying of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 50, *Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.* Christ had told these three, Matt. xvi. 28, that they should *see*, not *God*, but *the Son of man coming in his kingdom.* Peter had a desire to have inherited that joy wherewith his heart was ravished at the sight of our Saviour's transfiguration, which (as you heard before) was but a representation of his coming in glory to judge the world; and out of this desire he said, *Lord, it is good for us to be here: if*

thou wilt, let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and one for Elias. Yet as soon as he heard the voice, the antipathy between sinful flesh and the fruition of God's presence (or the inheritance of that kingdom of Christ which was then represented) begun to shew itself. And what shall we do, then, which are conscious of more grievous sins than St. Peter, St. James, or St. John then were? unto whom both the spectacle of Christ's glorious presence, and the voice or sound, which in that day shall be heard from heaven, will be far more terrible than any manifestation of God's presence, whether made by voice or sight unto our first parents, unto Gideon, unto Manoah, or unto any of his apostles recorded in scripture.

A view of the terrible spectacles and sounds preceding doomsday.

4. Let us now take a view of such representations or descriptions of the terrible spectacles which shall be seen, and of the terrible voices or sounds which in that last day shall be heard, as God's prophets or evangelists have framed to us.

These representations are of two sorts, either charactered out unto us in mere words, or in matters of fact historically related.

To begin with the terrible spectacles which shall appear before the last day, or at the least before the process or judgment begin. These are most punctually expressed by the prophet Joel, chap. ii. 30, 31 [o]: *And I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and the terrible day of the Lord come.* And Joel iii. 15, 16: *The sun and the moon shall be darkened, and the stars shall withdraw their shining. The Lord also shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem; and the heavens and the* 406

[o] See book i. ch. 24. [vol. i. p. 189.]

earth shall shake. The terrors here foretold were really represented by the first desolation of Judah and destruction of Jerusalem by the Assyrians and Chaldeans, whose approach to execute God's judgments upon that land and people was prophesied of by this prophet in the beginning of this second chapter; yet so foretold by him, as the plagues there threatened might by repentance have been prevented: so could not the terrors foretold in the second prophecy; at least the prophet expresseth no means for averting these fearful signs in the heavens and earth. This latter prophecy is in particular exemplified by our Saviour, Matt. xxiv. 27. 29. 30: *For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west; so shall also the coming of the Son of man be. Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory.* Both the prophecy of Joel and this prediction of our Saviour were in part fulfilled shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, by the burning of the mount Vesuvius in Campania, a province of Italy; the manner and effects whereof, how fearful and terrible they were, not to Rome only or Italy, but to a great part of Africa, to Egypt, to Syria, and to Constantinople, with the countries adjoining [p], and how consonant they were unto the prophet Joel's and our Saviour's prediction, may be gathered from Dion, in his 66th and 68th books, and from other Roman heathenish writers of those times. But how-

[p] See book 1. ch. 24. sect. 4, 5, &c. [vol. i. pp. 199, 200.]

ever the world had a general warning of the last judgment in that fearful spectacle, yet may we not deny that the like or more fearful spectacle shall be again exhibited upon or immediately before our Saviour's second coming.

From St. Peter's comments upon the forecited prophecy of Joel, Acts ii. 20, there ariseth a question; the prophet saith, as the Hebrew word imports, that these signs should be exhibited *before the great and terrible day of the Lord.* St. Peter saith, they shall be exhibited *before the great and conspicuous* or *notable day of the Lord:* so indeed the Seventy interpreters, whose translation St. Peter follows, render the Hebrew *hannora*, not as the Latins do, *horrendum*, or *tremendum*, but ἐπιφανῆ, *conspicuous:* and the reason why they so render it, as some later critics think, was, because they took the original word to be a derivative or branch of the Hebrew word *raah*, which signifies *to see*, and so the object of it should be only some visible apparition, or matter of sight: whereas the later and more accurate Hebricians take the same Hebrew word to be a branch of the root *jarah*, which signifieth *to fear*, or *dread;* and for this reason render it, not *the visible* or *conspicuous day*, but *the terrible day of the Lord.* But there is no necessity of conceiving any error, either in the Seventy interpreters, concerning the derivation of the Hebrew word *hannora*, or of any alteration of rules (concerning the right derivation of words) between the ancient and modern Hebricians; for the Greek word ἐπιφανὲς, which our English renders *notable* or *conspicuous*, is, as grammarians say, *mediæ significationis;* that is, general to any strange or uncouth apparitions in the heavens, whether they be apparitions of horror and dread, or only of lightsomeness or good

hope: *Every man prayed*, saith the author of the Second of Maccabees, chap. v. 4, that the *apparition might turn to good;* yet was the apparition then exhibited prodigious and fearful.

407 5. But the most lively representation of the last judgment, as well for matter of fearful spectacle, as for matter of terrible sound, was exhibited immediately by God himself at the promulgation of the law upon mount Sinai. *And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly.* Exod. xix. 16—18. Our apostle, Heb. xii. 21, addeth, (which is not in the Old Testament expressed,) *So terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake.* And if Moses, the man of God, did so exceedingly quake at this sight, who shall be able to stand without trembling and quaking at the like?

The terrors on mount Sinai, types of the terrors of doomsday.

But shall Christ's appearance at the last day be like to this fearful sight at the giving of the law? Yes, and a great deal more terrible. What comfort then doth the gospel of Christ afford us Christians more than Moses' law did the Israelites? The law being given in this terrible manner, did prognosticate or portend their fearful end which should adhere unto it, or seek salvation by it without the intercession of a mediator, who was to be the author and fountain of a better message, and more gladsome tidings from heaven

to all such as shall seek redemption by him, or absolution from the curse of the law.

This is the prerogative of the gospel, as it stands in opposition to the law; and this prerogative is prosecuted at large by our apostle in that chapter, Heb. xii. But the benefit of this prerogative is not absolutely universal, but conditional; it extends only to such as shall shew better obedience unto Christ and to his gospel, than most of the Israelites did to Moses and to his law. To such as contemn or disobey the gospel, Christ shall appear a more dreadful and terrible judge in the last day, than he appeared unto Israel in mount Sinai. This point of doctrine is fully prosecuted by our apostle, Heb. xii. 25—27: *See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven. And this word, Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.* God (as a learned Father observes) did call his people, at the giving of the law, unto the mountain then burning with fire, to testify unto the world what our apostle saith in the conclusion of chap. xii.; that *he is a consuming fire* unto the obstinate transgressors of his laws; and that fire and smoke, that burning, blackness, darkness, and tempest, shall be the everlasting portion of all such as shall not be found in Christ at the day of judgment, nor then absolved by him from the curse of the law.

6. The point which I would commend to the reader's more special consideration out of the 26th verse of this

A special observable, It was

Christ that shook the earth at the giving of the law.

chapter, is, 'That it was the voice of Jesus Christ, the Mediator of the new covenant, which did shake the earth at the giving of the law.' The apostle takes it as granted, from the common rule of interpretation, well known in those times, that the shaking of the earth then was an emblem or token of the mutability of the law, and of the unstability of the earth or
408 visible world itself. The earth being then subject to shaking or motion, did thereby testify itself to be obnoxious unto ruin and destruction: and in that (after this terrible commotion of the earth at the giving of the law, when *the mountains*, as the psalmist speaks, psalm cxiv. 4, *skipped like rams, and the little hills like young sheep*) God again, by the prophet Haggai, chap. ii. 6, denounceth, that *yet once more* he would suddenly *shake the heavens, and the earth, and the sea, and the dry land;* this intimates unto us, that the second commotion of the heavens and of the earth (which was to be *once*, and no more) should finally accomplish that which was foreshadowed or represented by the former commotion of the earth at the giving of the law. This second commotion shall bring the heaven and earth to ruin, and put an end to all things mutable; or (as our apostle speaks) it includes *the removing of those things that can be shaken, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain;* that is, that there may be a world everlasting. That which the prophet Haggai intimates more darkly, the prophet Isaiah had expressed more plainly, chap. xxxiv. 4: *And all the host of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heaven shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their host shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, and as a falling fig from the fig tree.*

The same vision was more lively and clearly made

unto St. John, Rev. vi. 12—14: *And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and, lo, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; and the stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind. And the heaven departed as a scroll when it is rolled together; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places.*

The dreadful sounds that will be heard at doomsday.

7. But that which shall add life and spirit to all these, is, the terrible voice or sound which shall then be heard, summoning all flesh to appear *before the judgment seat of Christ.* As it was the voice of Christ which did shake the earth at the giving of the law; so shall the voice of Christ (but a voice more terrible than that) produce this terrible commotion here mentioned in the heavens and in the earth: for, as St. Paul instructs us, 1 Cor. xv. 52, *the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised*, &c.: and again, 1 Thess. iv. 16; *The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first.* The terror of this voice, to such as sleep not in Christ, may be gathered from the power or efficacy of it, which is more fully expressed by St. John, Rev. xx. 13: *The sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them: and they were judged every man according to their works.* This universal efficacy of his voice is expressed by our Saviour, John v. 28, 29: *The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.*

Some late historians and astronomers[q] relate a natural eclipse of the sun so terrible in Spain, that the crows and other fowls of the air, seeking as it seems to fly from it, were so affrighted with the sudden increase of darkness about mid-day, that they fell down to the earth in a deadly astonishment: what tongue then can express the dread and horror which the terrible apparitions at that day shall produce in all such as have lived and died in incredulity or security of the judgment which shall follow them; in all, on whom that day shall come as suddenly (without any better observation or preparation for it) as the forementioned eclipse of the sun did upon the reasonless fowls of the air? Or if you desire a further description of the terror which shall then fall upon the inhabitants of the earth, even upon the most intrepid and undaunted, in respect of any ordinary terrors, then take
409 it from St. John, Rev. vi. 15, 16: *And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman, and every free man, hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us .....*

Thus much was distinctly likewise foretold, and prophetically set forth, by the prophet Isaiah, chap. ii. 11, &c. That neither St. John's words nor the prophet Isaiah's are hyperbolical, but are literally meant by them, and really and punctually to be fulfilled, is clear from our Saviour's interpretation of the prophet Isaiah, and the like passages of other prophets, at his going to the cross, Luke xxiii. 30, 31: *Then shall*

[q] Clavius. Another author tells, that the birds fell to the earth upon a great shout given by a multitude in an army, or at some great solemnity.

they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry? Howbeit this terror shall not merely proceed from these terrible spectacles and sounds which shall be antecedent to the final judgment, but from the sight of Christ placed in his seat of judicature. So St. John (in the forecited place, Rev. vi. 16.) tells us, that the affrightment and dread that seized upon the great men of the earth did arise from seeing *the face of him that sat upon the throne*, and *from the wrath of the Lamb.*

The process of the final judgment.

8. Having thus shewn the terrors antecedent to the process, we go on to the process itself. That takes beginning from the manner of Christ's coming and approach, or from his appearance as he shall sit in judgment. He shall come from heaven, or from the right hand of the throne of God, where he now sitteth, to execute judgment in the open air, or in that region wherein the clouds have their rake. The manner of his progress or approach shall be swift, and, as before hath been intimated, to our apprehension violent. For, at his coming to judgment, and not before, shall the prophet Isaiah's prayer or wish be accomplished : *Oh that thou wouldest rend the heavens, that thou wouldest come down, that the mountains might flow down at thy presence, as when the melting fire burneth, the fire causeth the waters to boil, to make thy name known to thine adversaries, that the nations may tremble at thy presence! When thou didst terrible things which we looked not for, thou camest down, the mountains flowed down at thy presence.* Isaiah lxiv. 1, 2, 3. But, because St. John intimates (in the forecited place) that the chief cause of terror was the sight of him that sat upon the throne, we shall first consider how his throne or pre-

sence is described in the Old Testament; secondly, how these descriptions or representations are deciphered or charactered out unto us (by more than parallels) in the New.

Now all the prophecies or predictions which to this purpose can be produced, must all be interpreted by the rule heretofore given[r]; that is, "However they may be literally meant or verified of some former times or events, yet they are verified or meant of them *inchoativè* only; they are not, they cannot be *completivè* applied to any other time or times, besides the day of final judgment, or the world to come, which shall ensue upon it;" the terror of his throne, and of him that sitteth thereon, is described, Dan. vii. 9, 10: *I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thou-*
410 *sand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.*

The fiery wheels are emblems of his sudden approach, or of the swiftness of his judgments to overtake his enemies: though the vision was new and uncouth, yet the branches of the things seen or revealed unto Daniel were known before unto God's prophets; his seat or throne was prepared of old; so saith the psalmist, psalm ix. 4: *Thou hast maintained my right and my cause; thou sattest in the throne judging right.* And again, vv. 6, 7: *O thou enemy, destructions are come to a perpetual end: and thou hast destroyed cities; their memorial is perished with them. But the Lord shall endure for ever:*

[r] Of this rule, see chap. 11. sect. 9. [p. 188. of this volume.]

he hath prepared his throne for judgment. [See psalm xcvi. 10—13. and ps. xcviii. 8, 9.] But Daniel saw more seats and thrones than one, albeit he mention (as perhaps he saw) none sitting in them: this, as one wittily commenteth upon this place of Daniel, is an emblem of the law, which was an emptiness or vacuum in respect of the gospel; and as all things else in the law prefigured or forepainted were solidly accomplished in the gospel, so these seats, which are here indefinitely represented unto us by Daniel, without any specification of their number, without intimation of any sitting on them, are pictured unto us by St. John, with twenty-four elders sitting upon them, Rev. iv. 4: *And round about the throne were four and twenty seats: and upon the seats I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment; and they had on their heads crowns of gold:* our Saviour had said unto his apostles, Matt. xix. 28, that *they should sit upon twelve seats, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.* And twelve heads of the tribes of Israel, or the like number of select ones, who lived under the old testament, may make up the number of twenty-four. That as all the truths of both testaments will consummately be fulfilled, so the saints of both may then be most perfectly united in the church triumphant.

9. But to proceed to such other representations as are to be found in the scripture: this manner of Christ coming to judge the earth, or of his appearance in glory, was represented unto Moses and to the Israelites, Exod. xxiv. 9—17: *The sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel:* and this fire had devoured them if they had approached the mountain, or God's presence, without God's invitation:

But Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, went up: and they saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not his hand.

This was a peculiar privilege or dispensation: *also they saw God, and did eat and drink;* and in this they represented the state of the elect; which, notwithstanding the terror of that last day, shall be invited by Christ, and be admitted to eat and drink with him in his kingdom. But this dispensation during the time of the law was not granted to all Israel, but to Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and to the seventy elders or nobles of Israel only; unto all the rest, whom God did not vouchsafe to invite, the spectacle, though seen afar off, was terrible; so terrible that they durst not approach unto it. So shall the coming of the Son of man be to all the kindreds of the earth, which have not hearkened to his sweet and loving invitations here on earth: all such as have neglected them, or make their appearance before him without a garment or habit in some sort suitable to the marriage unto which they have been invited, shall
411 be everlastingly excluded, and cast into utter darkness, where shall be nothing but *weeping, and wailing, and gnashing of teeth*——But the thread which I am now to follow is the forementioned prophecy, Dan. vii. 9.

10. Now whether in the vision of *the Ancient of days* God the Father were personally represented; or whether it were a representation of the Godhead or Divine Power only, as it is indivisibly in the blessed Trinity, without any note of personal difference; or whether at the last day there shall be any distinct

representation of Christ's sitting at the right hand of the Father; or whether the throne of the Son of God shall then only appear; are questions which I will refer wholly to the schools. It sufficeth us to believe and know, that *the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment,* especially this final judgment, *to the Son;* and that the SON OF MAN shall then appear in the glory of his Godhead, in glory equal to God the Father.

What manner of appearance this shall be, and how the world shall be affected with it, we are now to inquire so far as is fitting, taking the description of it from God's written word. And haply, lest we should conceive of God the Father as more ancient for days than the Son, (which transformation of the divine nature the pictures of the blessed Trinity, seen and allowed by the Roman church, do naturally and inevitably suggest to the unlearned,) St. John doth describe the Son of man, or that glory wherein the Son of God and the Son of man shall then appear, much after the same manner that Daniel had done the Ancient of days, Dan. vii. 9, 10. The description of the Son of God and of the Son of man taken by St. John is, Rev. i. 13—16: *And I saw in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters. And he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword: and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength.*

You have heard before out of the seventeenth of

St. Matthew, that St. Peter, James, and John, when they were spectators of his transfiguration, (which was but a representation of the Son of man's coming in his kingdom,) when they heard the voice out of the cloud, *fell on their faces, and were sore afraid*, until he *came and touched them, and said, Arise, be not afraid.* This sight or vision of his glory, Rev. i. 17, 18, was more terrible than the voice which they then heard: *When I saw him*, saith St. John, *I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and, behold, I am alive for evermore, Amen; and have the keys of hell and of death.* The exercise of this great power, and of the keys, shall not be fully manifested until his glorious appearance in judgment. The like description of the Son of man in his glory we have, Rev. xix. 11, 12: *And I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns.* Now albeit in this verse Christ be called *Faithful* and *True*, as being the sole and full accomplisher of our belief in God's promises, yet these titles are no way sufficient to express his dignity. To shew us that his glorious Majesty is altogether unexpressible by man or angel, it is expressly added by St. John in the next words, *And he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself.* And yet, ver. 13, it is said, *his name is called, The Word of God.* This is not that name which no man knew besides himself, for St. John knew him by this name when he wrote his Gospel; and this is a name which doth more fitly and more fully express the majesty, glory, and power wherein

Christ's exercise of the power of the keys of hell and death, not fully manifested till doomsday.

412

he shall at the last day appear, than the former attributes of Faithful and True, or any other name that is given unto him in the word of God: this contains all the rest. And they much disparage this name, and much eclipse the dignity contained in it, who restrain it only unto his fidelity in fulfilling or performing God's word to his elect, or to the execution of God's judgments upon their enemies; though all this be included in it, as it followeth, vv. 15, 16: *And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written,* KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS.

The great excellencies of Christ's name, *The Word.*

11. But both these descriptions of St. John, you will say, are emblematical, and not to be understood according to the letter, at the least Christ shall not at the day of judgment visibly appear in this form and habit, or with a sharp sword in his mouth. The real power and dignity, which is painted out unto us by this emblem, is already exemplified, and shall be further exemplified in defending his church in general, or advancing the estate of the forlorn Jewish nation before that great and terrible day, wherein he shall set a period to all wars and contentions, to all exercise of hostility against his church.

The real dignity emblemed in the sharp sword going out of Christ's mouth, is, defender of his church.

The power of Christ here described by St. John (the exercise whereof is not yet accomplished, but shall, as some interpreters think, be remarkably verified before the last day, in advancing the Jewish nation, and executing vengeance upon their persecutors) was most divinely displayed by Moses in that his excellent song, Deut. xxxii. 41, 42, and in particular represented in an emblem or character, like to

that which St. John saw: *If I whet my glittering sword, and mine hand take hold on judgment; I will render vengeance to mine enemies, and will reward them that hate me. I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh; and that with the blood of the slain and of the captives*, &c. But however this prophecy may be remarkably verified in the calling of the Jews, yet the majesty and power, which is pictured out unto us in these emblematical descriptions, whether made by Moses or St. John, shall not fully be accomplished or exemplified before the last day; at that last day, and not before, shall the full importance of his former name be made known; then he shall manifest himself to be the OMNIPOTENT and ETERNAL WORD.

Whether St. John and St. Paul, by *the word of God*, mean our Lord Jesus Christ.

But is the importance of this name, or emblem by which the power of it is emblazoned, to wit, his sharp and glittering sword, any where literally expressed in the apostles' writings? It is most fully and most emphatically, Heb. iv. 12, 13: *Vivus est sermo Dei; The word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword*, &c. Yet is it questioned by some, (whose names I conceal,) whether by *the word of God* in that place, the eternal Word himself be literally and directly meant; or whether St. Paul by *the word of God* means the selfsame that St. John doth in his Gospel, chap. i. 1, *In the beginning was the Word;* and again, ver. 14, *The Word was made flesh.* It is a very weak exception which some, otherwise learned interpreters of this Epistle, and powerful in the word of God, have made unto the contrary. The strength of their exception is this; 'Because the author of that Epistle nowhere else instyles the Son of God, *the Word of God.*' But to this exception the answer is very easy: 'Because the author of that

Epistle had nowhere else the like occasion thus to instyle him.' And the same exception, were it warrantable, might be taken against the literal meaning of St. John, or against the ordinary interpretation of the first verse of his Gospel; because St. John nowhere else, besides in the two verses before mentioned, instyles the Son of God by the same name; nor doth any other evangelist besides St. John instyle him by this name at all. Now because this passage of St. Paul, Heb. iv, is misinterpreted by divers, and not fully interpreted by any that I have read, and yet, being rightly or more fully interpreted, will give best light unto the manner of Christ's process in judgment, I cannot better bestow my pains and time than in the explication of those words, *Vivus est sermo Dei*, or *Vivum est verbum Dei: The word of God is quick and powerful*, &c. 413

12. If by *the word of God* in this place, the Son of God, God blessed for ever, be not literally and most directly meant, the full meaning of the apostle must be restrained either to the word of God written or spoken by his ambassadors. Now that the word of God, whether written or preached, (or both written and preached,) cannot be the direct and complete subject of the apostle's assertion in these two verses, the former arguments or exceptions against this interpretation will clearly evince, if we retort them thus: Such glorious attributes as are in these verses ascribed unto the word of God, are nowhere else, either in this Epistle, or in the Old Testament, or in the New, attributed to the word of God either as written or preached; no, not to it as preached by the Son of God himself; therefore this place cannot be fully or completely meant of the word of God either written or preached. No other besides the Son of God can

An explication of Heb. iv. 12, 13.

be the direct or principal subject of the literal and assertive sense in any proposition in these two verses contained. Yet do we not deny that both verses may in some sort be literally meant of the word preached or written, *pro modulo;* that is, so far as the word written or preached hath reference or analogy to the eternal Word, or to his power here described. For the Son of God is seldom, if at all, instyled *the Word of God*, without importance of some transcendent relation to the word of God written or preached. And from this affinity which the word written or uttered hath with the eternal and unutterable Word of God, the word written or preached may have some share or portion, as it were by reversion, in the attributes here assigned unto the Word of God.

The word writ or preached, not only nor chiefly meant, Heb. iv. 12.

But the complete subject either of the first proposition, 'The word of God is lively;' or of the second, 'The word of God is powerful;' or of the third, 'The word of God is sharper than any two-edged sword;' the word written or preached cannot be: nothing can be besides God himself, or that *Word* which St. John saith *was in the beginning*, in whom *was life*, and whose *life was the light of men*.

Nor are the peculiar and special attributes of God any where in scripture set forth in a more full and majestic character of words than in these words of St. Paul.

The propositions are in number seven or eight. The subject of all the propositions, ὁ Λόγος, THE WORD, is the same: and for this reason, if any of these attributes be literally meant of the Son of God, or of the Son of God only *completivè*, all the rest must be completely meant of him. He only it is, *qui tanti mensuram nominis implet*, who rightly fills the importance of this title, Λόγος, or *Word*, in that place. Admit

then the word written or preached may truly be said to be quick and powerful, and in some sort not more sharp, but more piercing, than any two-edged sword (for a sword with one edge may be as sharp as a sword with two edges, but not so piercing); but admit the word of God preached might be more piercing 414
than any sword, yet could it not properly be said to be *a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart*, or that *there is no creature which is not manifest unto it;* nor can it possibly be imagined to be the logical subject of the two last propositions: for the apostle plainly speaks of a living person; *Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in* HIS SIGHT, *but all things are naked and open unto the eyes* OF HIM πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, that is, as our English renders it, *with whom we have to do;* as Beza and Calvin had before better expressed it than Erasmus, who renders it, *of whom we speak;* or than the Vulgar Latin, *ad quem nobis est sermo;* of which Latin I know not how to make good English. But the Syriac of all most fully: *All things are opened unto the eyes of him, to whom men must render an account.* Every one that hears the word preached, must give an account of the word which he hears; but this account we must not, we cannot give unto the word preached, but unto him whose words they are which we hear, or from whom the word preached must derive all the efficacy, force, and power which it hath.

The full meaning of the original, if any be disposed to have it fully rendered in the original tongue, is as much as, ᾧ ἐσμὲν ὑπεύθυνοι, *cui a nobis reddenda est ratio*, "to whom we must render our final account;" such is the usual importance of the word λόγος in matters civil, or of contract or covenant. So saith Athanasius in his Creed; at his coming to judge the

quick and the dead, "all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give ACCOUNT for their own works." And our apostle supposeth that this account must be given by every one, before he receive his doom for *things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

13. So then all men must be ὑπεύθυνοι, must *reddere rationem*, render a final account of their own works; and we Christians in special, of the word of God read or preached unto us, how far it hath fructified or miscarried in us. And this account, or λόγον, we must render τῷ Λόγῳ, to the eternal Word or Son of God, by whom God made the world. But albeit St. Paul by the word Λόγος, Heb. iv, mean the selfsame person or party whom St. John doth in the first of his Gospel; yet may we hence discover a further notion or importance of the same word Λόγος, as it is the peculiar title of the Son of God, than was before (book 7. chap. 26. vol. vii. p. 224.) expressed in handling that point, how the Word was made flesh, or why the Son of God was called THE WORD. The reason was, not only because he was the speaker of the Trinity, or the declarer of God's will unto men, nor because he was the main object of all God's word, whether revealed to Moses or the prophets; but specially or most principally, for that he was the express image of God the Father, or, *verbum internum*, the full expression of the wisdom, power and majesty of the Father; and withal more than the ideal pattern, according to which all things were made. For though he be the full expression of the power and wisdom of his Father, as he is his only begotten Son from all eternity, yet are not all things, which are made by him, or can be made by him, a full expression of his power or wisdom. He was begotten, not made, by his Father, and therefore

equal to him. The world was made by him, not begotten, and therefore far inferior to him. He is a pattern, or λόγος, of all things that are made; but a pattern that cannot be paralleled by them. As he was the pattern, or λόγος, by whom the world was made, and so considered by St. John, so is he the pattern or exemplary rule of all the laws which God hath given to man, whether written in their hearts, or in the book of grace, or of nature; the rule or pattern of all the words which God hath spoken to men by his apostles, by his prophets, or by this Λόγος or Son himself. And 415
according to this notion or importance of the word Λόγος, he is by St. Paul called ὁ Λόγος, unto whom all men must *reddere* τὸν λόγον, render an account of their words, of their works, and of their thoughts: he being in all respects the most complete rule or exemplar by which all words, all works and thoughts, for which men are to make account, are to be valued or censured; the only μέτρον, or exact measure of all approbation or disprovement of the accompts to be made, or of the words, works, or thoughts, for which we are to render account. From this notion or importance of the word Λόγος, we may take a true notion or scantling of the attributes or titles given to the word of God by St. Paul, Heb. iv, and how well they consort with the word written or preached, as it hath reference to this eternal Word. The word of God written or preached, although in itself it be more powerful than any two-edged sword, yet, as it is managed or wielded by us his weak instruments, is but as a good sword in an infant's hand; but though as uttered by us it doth not exercise its strength upon our hearers, yet doth it not utterly perish or lose its efficacy; but every word spoken in his name, though for the present it have no such success as we could wish,

yet it is not altogether spoken in vain, it returns unto him whose word it is; and in his mouth or presence the word preached by us becomes like Scanderbeg's sword in Scanderbeg's hand, and shall in the last day recover strength and force from the powerful appearance of this eternal Word, or Λόγος. So that all the glorious attributes given by St. Paul unto the word of God, are primarily and principally true of the eternal Word, yet secondarily and less principally of the word preached with reference unto him.

14. The word preached is not altogether dead, but lively, and quick, and powerful in its operation; and shall at the last day be more piercing than any two-edged sword, and divide between the spirit and the soul. A two-edged sword may cut the bones, and divide the joints and the marrow, it may divide the soul from the body, or at least send the soul out of the body before the time by the course of nature allotted. But between the soul and the spirit no material sword can make division. The most piercing sword, though it hath (as the original imports) two mouths to devour, yet eyes it hath none to distinguish between the parts which it divides, but cuts as it falls, or as it is directed by the eyes and hands of him which wields it; but the Word of God, here principally meant, seeth all the particles betwixt which it makes division; it *is a discerner* or *judge of the thoughts and intents of the heart,* how secret soever they be, how inseparable soever they be from the soul or spirit; though our inward parts be covered with skin, with flesh and bones, yet are they naked, and as it were anatomized, (for so the original imports,) unto the eyes of this Λόγος, to whom we are to render our account.

In the first creation he was not only ὁ Λόγος, the live idea or pattern, unto whose image men and angels

were created, and of whose excellency the whole world, and all the creatures in it, are but scattered and broken expressions; but withal, Λόγος δημιουργὸς, the Framer or Maker of all things visible and invisible; for God the Father made all things by this Λόγος, without any instrumental help or service, after a more excellent and expedite manner, than (should we suppose, or could we imagine such a thing) any architect or skilful artificer, that could be supposed able to frame or make a material building, or other work of his profession, without any manual labour, without any materials or instruments, besides the pattern or exemplar which he conceives in his mind or imagination. In the dissolution of this world, or in the erection of the world to come, which shall take beginning from the day of our final accompts, 416 the same Λόγος, or eternal Word of God, shall manifest himself to be, not only the live idea or pattern of God's moral or eternal law, by which all mankind shall be judged, and our accompt either finally approved or disproved, but to be withal λόγος ζῶν καὶ ἐνεργὴς, a law endued with life, with wisdom and power; nor such a law only, but a living, wise, omnipotent Judge. All these attributes, or the things signified by them, with all the rest that can be required in a law, a rule, or judge, are in him undivided, and according to the infinity of perfection. Yet that we may the better conceive the infiniteness of his perfection, as law and judge, it will not be amiss to consider of these attributes severally, as they are found amongst us.

15. Every good law is a kind of silent magistrate or judge; and every good and perfect judge or magistrate is a speaking law. So they ought to be. But these two perfections seldom meet in the government of any well ordered commonweal or church on earth. In some nations the written laws be tolerably good, or

comparatively very good, but the magistrates for the most part either ignorant in the laws, or unexperienced in applying their true intent and meaning to meet with every transgression, or so manacled with golden fetters, that they have no great list or dexterity to put what they know in execution. In other places the magistrates or judges are learned and sincere laws to themselves, and fit laws for others to be ruled by, were not their good purposes restrained or pinioned by harsh and obsolete laws, or not well consorting with the times wherein they live.

This jargon between wise and wholesome laws, and unskilful or corrupt magistrates, or between religious, wise, and industrious magistrates, and imperfect, partial, or naughty laws, hath been in most ages and nations so common, that many accurate politicians, or observers of the course of justice, have brought the main question concerning all state government to this short issue, and submitted it to the touch and trial of learned dispute, 'Whether it be better to be governed by a dead and silent, or by a live and speaking law?' that is, whether were most expedient for all or most states, that the written law should be above the supreme magistrate, or majesty; or the supreme magistrate, or majesty of every nation, above the written laws? But admitting that every nation had laws as perfect as the wit of man could devise, such as would give contentment to every member that were to be governed by them, and magistrates to put such laws in execution, as sincere, as wise, as well experienced, as industrious, as courageous as any in former times have been, or can in this life be expected; yet the most perfect or absolute law that can be made by man, that can be written, though made by God himself, could not be able to put itself in execution, or to

recompense every transgression as it deserves. Nor can the wisest, the most sincere and industrious magistrate possibly know every transgressor of the law, or every misdemeanour committed within a little province or corporation. And albeit the magistrate only can give life to the law, yet can no magistrate give life to any law, or put it in execution according to the rule of justice, unless he know the transgressor and the quality of his transgression: and for this reason, even those states which have comparatively the best laws and the wisest magistrates, admit, or rather require and authorize informers: and after the information given, the magistrate must proceed *secundum allegata et probata*, according to the information given by legal and competent witnesses. Now to make the informers and witnesses always sincere, the best laws and magistrates are not able.

The law of God indeed is a law most perfect, most infallible, but no living rule to see and discern every transgression against it, no speaking rule to give in- 417
formation or testimony against the transgressors of it, much less a living judge to reward or punish every observer or transgressor of it. But all the perfections that can be imagined in any law, in any informer, in any witness, in any judge or manager of justice, are eminently and most perfectly contained in this *Word*, or Λόγος, *with whom we have to do*, or *to whom we are to render our accompt*, without any tincture or admixture of their imperfections. And thus they all are in him most perfect, not by way of union or unition, but according to most perfect and indivisible unity.

Most high perfections implied in ὁ λόγος.

As all things were made by him without help or instrumental service, so all the thoughts, all the words and works of men are immediately known unto him without any prompter or informer, and every

man shall be judged by him according to all his works without any advocate or assistant. As he is the express image or full expression of his Father's person, and himself as truly God as his Father is, so he is the μέτρον, or *mensura omnium*, the exact measure of every thing that can be known, that can be done, spoken, or thought, and the just recompense of all deserts. He contains an exact proportion or disproportion to every thought, word, or action, that hath proceeded from the heart or mind of man—an exact proportion of every thought, word, or deed, that held consort with the law of the mind or of the spirit—an exact disproportion to every rebellious motion that hath been conceived by the law of the flesh against the law of the mind; and even in this respect he is called ὁ λόγος, or λόγος λόγων; for so the original word oft-times imports as much as *proportion*, or *an exact measure*, by which all proportion or consonancy, all disproportion or dissonancy, may be known or notified: as, if the basis or diapason be sound and good, every note or sound of the same instrument doth notify the measure of its consonancy or dissonancy to it by its own sound. And in this sense he is λόγος ζῶν καὶ ἐνεργὴς, *a living measure* or *proportion*. And every thought or secret inclination of man, that is consonant to this living rule or law, hath more than a geometrical proportion, a live proportion or sympathy with him. And we shall need no other bliss and happiness than a true sympathy and consort with him. Every thought or inclination of the flesh that is dissonant to this living rule, or λόγος, includes more than a dead disproportion, a live antipathy to his purity; and according to the measure of every man's disproportion or antipathy to this living rule shall the measure of his wretchedness or infelicity be. In all these

and many other respects is the Son of God instyled ὁ Λόγος, as he is the Judge of quick and dead.

16. But doth the intent or inference of the apostle, in that fourth chapter to the Hebrews, lead us unto any such apprehension or construction as hath been made of his attributes? It doth, if we look not, as the Jews did, only into the dead letter, but dive into the live sense or meaning of the Spirit, or of the apostle himself: his principal scope or aim was to admonish his hearers, and in them all that confess Christ to be the Son of God and their Redeemer, to be vigilant and careful *whilst it is called To day*, that they do not incur God's high displeasure, or provoke his sentence of utter exclusion from that eternal rest, whereof that rest which Joshua brought the Israelites unto, when he gave them possession of the land of Canaan, was but the map or shadow. The Israelites without exception had a promise of entering into the land of Canaan, and under it a promise of entering into a better rest. *But the word preached*, saith the apostle, ver. 2, *did not profit them, not being mixed with faith.* The foolish posterity of those rebellious fathers, which were excluded by oath from entering into the land of Canaan, and were consumed in the wilderness, mis- 418
deemed that God's promise of bringing that nation into the land of their rest had been accomplished in the conquest of it by Joshua, or in continuance of like victorious success unto themselves. And by this conceit, and by the disobedience (which this conceit brought forth) against the Son of God revealed, the most of this nation, since his manifestation in the flesh, have lived and died in a more miserable estate than their fathers did which died in the wilderness. For neither Christian charity, nor the analogy of Christian faith, will permit us to say or think, that all the Israelites

which were excluded by oath from entering into the land of Canaan, or of their promised earthly rest, were also utterly excluded from entering into the kingdom of heaven. They, as well as we, were to render an accompt unto this eternal Word; for he it was which spake to Moses in mount Sinai, but was not then manifested in the flesh; nor was the article of his incarnation expressly or explicitly known to all or most that received benefit by it. The accompt which they were to make was not so punctual, nor their examination so strict. For that which St. Paul saith of the ancient heathens holds true in proportion of the ancient Israelites: *God*, saith he, *winked at these times of ignorance; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness.* Acts xvii. 30, 31. But was not this day appointed in these times of ignorance at which God winked? Yes, before them; but not so fully declared, nor the manner of it so distinctly known, as since Christ's resurrection it hath been. From this difference of times, and from the different condition of men living since Christ's resurrection, and from the diversity of the account which they must render, in respect of them which lived before it, St. Paul makes that inference, Heb. iv. 11: *Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief* (or *disobedience*). The Israelites fell in the wilderness for their disobedience to God's word written or spoken; they did not so immediately trespass against this Λόγος, or Word, which since hath been made flesh, as all unbelievers and disobedient men since he was made flesh.

Now to fortify this inference he addeth, vv. 12, 13, *Vivus est sermo Dei: The Word*, or Λόγος, *to*

whom we are to render an accompt, is quick, and powerful, more piercing than any two-edged sword. So far from winking at the ignorance of these times, *that all things are naked and open unto his eyes. His countenance*, as St. John saith, *was as the sun shineth in his strength*, Rev. i. 16: *and his eyes as a flame of fire*, ver. 14. Unto his eyes thus opened, when the judgment shall be set, *the books*, as Daniel saith, *were opened*, chap. vii. 10. And this prophecy is unfolded by St. John, Rev. xx. 12: *And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened: and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works.*

17. This is the next part of the process; and by *the books* which are opened, the best interpreters, ancient and modern, understand the books of conscience, which until that day shall not be unfolded, or become fully legible, no not unto them which keep these books, though every man have one of them, or at least an exact copy or exemplification of them. For it may be that the authentic copy or register of every man's conscience is treasured up in this eternal Λόγος, and their copies shall become legible by his appearance. Many actual sins, many secret thoughts, or evil words, have been daily practised or entertained by us, which leave no print or impression in our phantasies of their passage. The memory of many gross sins, which for the present make deep impres- 419
sion, daily wears out or decays to our apprehensions; their print or character in some being defaced or obliterated by new ones more gross; as if a man should write in capital letters upon a paper already written in a smaller character and more obscure. In others, the

The books to be opened at Christ's coming

records of conscience, though in themselves legible, so they would look into them, are wrapt up in multiplicity of business[q]. But when the Judge shall appear in his glory, the book shall be fully opened, the character or impression of every sinful thought or action shall then become legible; not a syllable of what we have spoken to ourselves shall be lost; and every letter and every syllable which hath not been washed away or purified by the blood of the Lamb, shall be as a stigma or brand to the soul and conscience wherein it is found, and shall fret as an incurable gangrene or canker. Every seed of corruption, whether propagated from our first parents, or sown by ourselves, which seemed to lie dead without all motion, unless they be truly mortified by the Spirit, shall at the appearance of the Sun of righteousness begin to quicken and grow ripe in a moment. And albeit these seeds be as many in number as the sand, though our whole flesh or bodily man be more full of them than any fish's ventricle is full of spawn, yet the least of them shall grow for its malignant quality into a serpent, and sting the soul and body wherein it bred like an adder. These are the best fruits which they that daily sow unto the flesh shall then reap of the flesh, even corruption, sorrow, and torments incorruptible and unsufferable, yet perpetually to be suffered by them. But of the quality and perpetuity of these pains hereafter, by God's assistance, when we come to the award or sentence.

18. Now to conclude; albeit this ὁ Λόγος, this *eternal Word of God*, before whose judgment seat we must appear, and to whom we are to render our final accompt, were made flesh, to the end and purpose that the very words of God immediately uttered by

[q] See book 11. ch. 10. §. 9. [p. 156. of this volume.]

himself, which formerly so uttered did sound nothing but death and destruction to flesh and blood, might become the very food of life, being thus distilled and uttered by an organ of flesh; yet such they are only unto such as receive him, and are purified in soul and conscience by them. *To such as received him*, saith St. John, *he gave this privilege to become the sons of God*, chap. i. 12. But *every man*, saith the same St. John, 1 Epist. iii. 3, *that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.* As for the disobedient, and such as wallow in filthiness, the presence or voice of God, though he appear or speak unto us in our nature, shall not be less dreadful to them than it was before the Word was made flesh; but rather his appearance in our nature shall add terror and dread to his voice and presence. And therefore it is remarkably added by St. John, Rev. vi. 16, that the disobedient *shall say to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.* For though the wisdom of the flesh did always include an enmity unto the purity of the divine nature, yet this enmity or antipathy is most directly against the innocency and integrity of the Lamb; it is under the same kind with the enmity of the woman's seed and the serpent's, nor shall the malignity of it fully appear or come unto a perfect crisis, until the Lamb appear in judgment. He is now a Lamb mild and gentle, and easy to be entreated by all such as seek to become like him in innocency and purity of life, but shall in that day manifest himself to be *the Lion of the tribe of Judah*, to execute vengeance upon all such as have abused his patience and longsuffering by continuance in beastliness, or enmity to lamb-like innocency and purity.

He shall then appear an inflexible Judge, but yet
420 continues a merciful and loving High Priest to make intercession for us. *Seeing then*, saith St. Paul, Heb. iv. 14, &c., (and it is his conclusion of his former description of him, as our omnipotent all-seeing Judge,) *that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God*, (this is a title more mild and comfortable than the former of Λόγος. *The Word of God*,) *let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.* This *time of need* is the day of judgment, or time of death.

But whereby shall we make just proof and trial, whether we hold our profession fast or no? By no other means than by the preserving the integrity and purity of our conscience: for we do not truly acknowledge or believe him to be our high priest, unless we suffer him, *whilst it is called To day*, to cleanse and purify our consciences. *If our heart condemn us not*, saith St. John, 1 Epist. iii. 21, *then have we confidence toward God.* To shut up all with that of the prophet Malachi, chap. iii. 2. 3, which is fully parallel to the former place of St. Paul, Heb. xii. 12, 13: *He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.* So then they must be *sons of Levi*, (that is, men consecrated unto the service of the Lord,) and, even in this life, as gold and silver, (though mingled with dross,) which hope to escape that last and fiery trial. And such as hope to be

made kings and priests unto our God for ever, must in this life be careful and diligent to practise upon themselves, daily presenting unto him, first, *the sacrifices of God, a troubled and broken spirit,* (breathing out prayers, and sending forth tears,) and then *their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable.* And lastly, *the sacrifice of praise,* that is, *the calves* or *fruit of the lips;* withal, not forgetting *to do good, and to communicate, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.*

19. The use of all that is said in this whole third section, concerning Christ's coming to judgment, is most flagrantly set down in powerful and moving expressions by St. Peter, 2 Epist. chap. iii. And the short of his three inferences is this: *Beloved, I stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance: ..... knowing that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of his coming? ..... But the Lord is not slack concerning his promise, ... but is longsuffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night. ..... Seeing then that all these things must be ..... what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God? .... Seeing that ye look for such things, be diligent that ye may be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless. And account that the longsuffering of the Lord is salvation..... Ye therefore, seeing ye know all these things before, beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own stedfastness. But grow in grace, and in the know-*

ledge of our Lord and Saviour JESUS CHRIST. *To him be glory both now and for ever.* AMEN.

St. Ambrose's Creed.—"Lord Jesus, we believe that thou shalt come to be our Judge. We therefore pray thee, help thy servants, whom thou hast redeemed with thy most precious blood. Make them to be numbered with thy saints, in glory everlasting."

421 SECTION IV.

Of the Resurrection of the Dead.

OF the five general heads, proposed in the so oft mentioned ninth chapter, we have (after a sort) dispatched the first three. The fourth was, The parties to be judged, viz., the quick and the dead. Of those that shall be found alive at the coming of our Lord, I shall say no more than this (till I come to the fifth head, touching the final award): The one distinction shall stand with great boldness, and with joy lift up their heads, that they (being caught up in the clouds) may meet the Lord in the air, and so be ever with the Lord. The other, retchless and most wretched part of mankind, shall—but all in vain—cry to the hills to fall upon them, and to the rocks to cover them from his eyes, to whom night and hell are manifest. Of those that sleep in the dust, *the dead in Christ shall rise first*, and having happily passed the judgment of discussion[a], shall be amazed at the strangeness of their own salvation so far beyond all they looked for. Then shall the *dead in sin* be raised also, to receive the dreadful sentence of our most worthy Judge

[a] Psalm xxxii. 1.

eternal, and to put on such immortality as shall only make them capable of the wages of sin, which is eternal death, or endless vivacity unto torments. The proof of the resurrection of both these is our next design.

CHAP. XIII.

1 CORINTH. XV. 12, 13.

Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen.

Job xix. 25—27. *I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me.*

Ezekiel xxxvii. 4, 5. *O ye dry bones, hear the word of the Lord. Behold, I will cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live,* &c.

John v. 28, 29. *Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.*

John xi. 24, 25. *Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day. Jesus said unto her, I am the resurrection, and the life,* &c.

The Belief of this Article of the Resurrection, of high concernment, malignantly oppugned by Satan and his Agents, needs and deserves our best Fortification. The Heathen had implicit Notions of a Resurrection. The Obstacle of Impossibility removed by Proof of this Conclusion, That though all things were annihilated, yet God is able to retrieve or recover the numerical same.

1. So admirable is the constancy of the celestial 422
bodies in their courses, that every unusual spectacle

in the heavens, be it but the appearance of a comet in the air, or of two suns, whereof the one is in the air, not in the heaven, doth always imprint a terror or amazement in the inhabitants of the earth. Whence if we could, out of a serious apprehension of both, rightly compare the face of the heavens as now it is, with that strange alteration described by St. John, Rev. vi. 12, 13; as that the pale moon shall be turned into blood; that the sun, which now dazzles our eyes with its brightness, shall become as black as a sack-cloth of hair; or that the fixed stars, which have continued their march from east to west without check or control for almost six thousand years, (and yet have kept their ranks without any declination to the right hand or to the left,) shall then begin to reel and stagger like so many drunken men, and fall to the earth, like as when a fig tree casteth her green figs, being shaken of a mighty wind: the very cogitation of this sudden change or confusion would make death seem a welcome messenger, and loss of life and external senses a gainful exchange, if by their loss we might be exempted or acquit from those fearful sights wherewith the eyes, or from those hideous noises wherewith the ears and hearts of all then living shall be filled. But most men hope for, or at least expect a dissolution of this sensitive life before the appearance of that great and terrible day. And this very imagination or conceit, that all our senses shall be locked up by death—the ears utterly deprived of hearing—the eyes of sight—that the whole body, even the heart itself, being bestript of all feeling or motion, shall put on a thick covering of sad earth, doth for the most part benumb our senses, enfeeble our faith, and dead our apprehensions, either of the terrors of that day, or of the joys that shall ensue unto all them that do escape

them. Whilst we think of death, or of their estate which have been long dead, and consumed in the grave, we say in our hearts, not as the psalmist did, *Lord, shall the dead praise thee?* but, shall the dead fear thee, O Lord? shall such as descend into the pit, are covered with dust, and resolved into rottenness, be affrighted with thy voice, or stand amazed at thy appearance? Thus then, as there is no article of Christian faith more available to make men live a Christian life, than this article of the last general judgment, so there is no branch, either of this general, or any other article of Christian faith in particular, which requireth more fortification, whether from the storehouse of the book of nature, or from the book of grace, than this point of the resurrection doth. This is the hold, which Satan, the sworn enemy of our souls' eternal peace and welfare, seeks by all means to surprise and subvert, and unto whose speedy surprisal, or utter subversion, flesh and blood have been in all ages most prone to yield their consent and furtherance. As *Christ crucified* was the main *stumblingblock to the Jew*[b], so the preaching of his resurrection, and of our hopes of a joyful resurrection by the power and virtue of his, was the main rock of offence, of contradiction, or gainsaying to the infidels or irreligious heathens: *When the Athenians*, saith St. Luke, Acts xvii. 32, (these were the most civil and learned people amongst the heathen,) *heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter.* The rest of his learned and philosophical discourse, all of them heard with attention; and would he have spoken more, they would have been willing to have heard him longer upon any other argument; but their entertain-

[b] 1 Cor. i. 23.

ment of this treatise of the resurrection was generally
423 so rude, so unrespective on their parts, and so unwelcome to him, that he immediately departed from them. Howbeit, God did not leave the truth delivered by him, even in this point, without competent testimony; for Denis of Areopagus, and a woman named Damaris, with some others, did believe Paul; but these were but a few in respect of them that did not believe, or did mock him. Now it is a rule undoubted, that the same motives or temptations which drew the heathen to contradict or oppugn the truth, will abate or weaken the assent of Christians unto the same truth, unless they be removed by discovery of their original error.

Three errors about the last judgment.

2. The errors concerning the final judgment, (in general or indefinitely considered,) are specially three. The first, of such as denied the Divine Providence over men, or did confine it to this transitory life without expectation of any account or reckoning to be made after death. And these were but few among the ancient heathens; to wit, the sect of Epicures, whose opinion was refuted by the verdict of most other heathens, and by the contradiction which the denial of the Divine Providence did include unto the opinions of the Epicures themselves.

The second gross error or branch of infidelity concerning the final judgment, was, the denial of the immortality of the human soul[c]; and this was accounted an heresy or impious opinion by the most, and hath been exquisitely refuted by the most learned amongst the heathens.

The third error or branch of infidelity concerning the final judgment, was, the denial, ignorance, or doubt of the resurrection of the body, or of the

[c] See Tully De Senectute.

whole man, as consisting of body and soul. And this error in some degree or other was most general to all the heathen. All such as denied either the Divine Providence or the immortality of the soul, all such as doubted or were ignorant of either of these truths, did likewise deny, or were doubtful or ignorant of the resurrection of the body. But on the contrary, neither all nor most of such as did deny, or were ignorant or doubtful of the resurrection of the body, did either deny or were ignorant or doubtful of the immortality of the soul.

But no marvel if the heathens, which did not doubt of the immortality of the soul, were altogether, or for the most part, ignorant of the resurrection of the body, whenas in this church of Corinth, which God had visibly graced with many excellent gifts of the Spirit, there were some—a great sort too many—which said there was no resurrection of the dead; and the Thessalonians, a people docile, and apt to take the impression or most lively character of Christianity, a people excelling other Christians in brotherly love, were ignorant, in part, of this great mystery, and from their ignorance or scant measure of knowledge in it, did mourn beyond measure for their dead, 1 Thess. iv. 13, &c. Of these Corinthians and Thessalonians, and of the heathens, that of our Saviour unto the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 29, is most true: *They therefore erred because they knew not the scriptures, nor the power of God.*

Two points proposed.

We are then, first, to remove that obstacle of impossibility, which is pretended from nature, and may seemingly be argued by natural and philosophical reasons.

Secondly, to set down the manner of the resur-

rection, and the positive proofs of it out of the scriptures or word of God.

3. Albeit none of the heathens did expressly acknowledge such a resurrection as we believe, although the most of them were ready to deny it when it was proposed unto them, yet many of them had divers implicit notions of it. There were, though not in any one sect of their philosophers, yet in divers sects,
424 such scattered relics or fragments of this eternal truth, as being skilfully put together, will represent more than most Christians conceive of it.

Pythagoras's broken notion of a resurrection.

The first fragment or implicit notion of it was that ancient opinion, fathered upon Pythagoras, 'That the souls of men, after their departure from their proper bodies, did (according to their several demeanours) enter into brute beasts or other creatures. The souls of men which had been given to spoil and raven, were, in this philosopher's opinion, to be imprisoned in the bodies of wolves, of lions, or tigers. Such as had been given over to beastly pleasures, were to take up their habitations in the bodies of swine. The souls of others less harmful, yet stupid and dull, had their transmigration allotted by this philosopher into sheep or calves. This metempsychosis, or flitting of men's souls into the bodies of beasts, is described by Ovid in the 15th of his Metamorphoses, seeking to give some countenance to his poetical fictions from Pythagoras's philosophical opinion plausible in ancient times. And from this conceit or opinion it was[d], that Pythagoras and his followers did abstain from eating of any flesh, whether of birds or beasts, and laboured by all means to persuade others to like abstinence, lest, by killing or devouring them, they might indeed

[d] See Juvenal, Sat. xv. 174.

kill or devour their dearest friends, kinsfolks, or neighbours:

Mandere vos vestros scite, et sentite colonos.

The souls of virtuous or good men, or of better spirits, did, in this philosopher's opinion, either go into some place of happiness, or else return into some human body again; so as one and the same man might be often begotten, born, or die. Thus Pythagoras himself thought that Euphorbus's soul was come into his body, that he himself had been present at the siege of Troy, in the shape and likeness of him that was called then Euphorbus; whose body was turned to dust long before any part of this Pythagoras's body was framed. And in the confidence of this opinion or imagination, he laid claim unto Euphorbus's shield, as the right owner of it.

This opinion or imagination, though gross and foolish, doth yet include these two branches of truth:

The solid truth extract out of Pythagoras's opinion of transmigration.

First, That *animus cujusque est unusquisque*, the soul or mind of man is the man himself.

And second, That the soul remains in being after the body or visible part (which is but as the case or husk) be dissolved.

Both these Tully had collected (as he professes in his book De Senectute) from the followers of Pythagoras, of Socrates, and Plato. These both he (or the person he makes speaker there) repeats in his piece De Somnio Scipionis. . . . *Tu vero . . . . sic habeto, Te non esse mortalem, sed corpus hoc; nec enim is es, quem forma ista declarat, sed mens cujusque is est quisque, non ea figura quæ digito monstrari potest. Deum te igitur scito esse . . . .*

Yet were it possible (or had God, to whom all things are possible, so appointed) that one and the same immortal soul of man should have its habitation in two,

three, or more distinct bodies, they should not be so truly many men, as one and the same man; for the unity or identity of man's person depends more immediately and necessarily upon the unity or identity of the soul, than upon the unity or identity of the body. This progress of one and the same soul through divers bodies, was not (in the opinion of such as first conceived or nursed it) to continue for ever: for Pythagoras did not deny an eternal rest unto men's souls after this pilgrimage or progress were ended[e]. Now this progress or pilgrimage, as some avouch, was to endure but unto the production of the third or fourth body.

425 4. From Pythagoras and the Druids (whom Pythagoras did rather follow than teach) Plato did not much differ. All of them in some points hold good consort with Christianity; in these especially:

Points wherein heathens held consort with Christianity.

First, That the soul of man doth not perish with the body, from which it is by death dissolved.

Secondly, That it should go well with such as lived well, and ill with such as lived amiss, after the dissolution of soul and body.

But how often one and the same soul by Plato's opinion might become a widower, how long it might so continue, or with how many several bodies it might successively match, we will not question.

In this and the like particulars, Pythagoras and Plato might many ways err without any gross inconsonancy to their general principles. And one of Plato's general principles was, 'That the human soul was in the body, *tanquam nauta in nave*, after such a manner as the master mariner is in the ship to direct and guide it.' And as a mariner may without loss undertake the government of divers ships successively,

[e] Vid. Forcatulum, lib. 1. pp. 87, 90.

so one and the same reasonable soul might guide or manage sundry bodies. In the opinion of Pythagoras or Plato, diversity of actions, of manners, of dispositions, did no more argue diversity of human souls or spirits, than variety of musical sounds in various wind instruments (as in the sackbut, cornet, shalm, or trumpet) doth argue diversity of breath or of musicians. One and the same musician may wind them all successively, and yet the music shall be much different, because of the diversity of the instrument. In all these opinions they did only *err, not knowing the scriptures.* They did not err against, at least their error includes no opposition unto, *the power of God.* For if it had pleased him thus to place the soul in the body, or to take it out of one body and put it into another, as these philosophers dreamed, so it might have been, so it must have been. Nor did their error include any denial of *the power of God*, but rather an approach or step to the discovery or acknowledgment of it, against modern atheists.

Others there were, who held a παλιγγενεσία, that is, a regeneration or new production of one and the same man again. These were the Genethliaci, or *nativity-casters;* of whom St. Augustine (out of Varro) speaks, De Civitate Dei, lib. 22. cap. 28. The time which (as that father there says) they prefixed for this παλιγγενεσία, or reproduction of the selfsame men, which formerly had been, was four hundred and forty years; though (as you will soon see) other authors make it far above that proportion. This particular error of theirs took its original from an error common to most philosophers, whose generally affected custom it hath been, to assign some external cause of every external or visible effect. And some modern astrologers make the heavens such total causes of sublu-

The opinion of the Genethliaci.

nary effects, that if the position and conjunction of stars should possibly come to be the selfsame again as they formerly have been, the selfsame bodies should be produced again which formerly had been. And sixteen thousand years (I take it), in the account of these ancient astrologers, did make up the full period or circuit of all celestial motions. Now it is a general maxim in philosophy, *Idem, secundum idem, semper producit idem.* If the influence of the stars were the full and total cause of the sublunary effects, it would follow directly, that when the conjunction of stars which affords this influence, returned the same again which it had been for sixteen thousand years ago, (or years more or fewer,) the sublunary effects or events should be the same as they then had been, and the same men which had formerly died should revive again.

This error of the Genethliaci may facilitate the Christian's belief of God's power.

5. The Genethliaci did foully err in imagining the stars or host of heaven to be the adequate or total causes of sublunary effects or alterations. They might err again in calculating the course of the stars; and (for aught I know) they did err in denying, or not
426 avouching the immortality of the soul. But herein they come the nearest to us Christians in this article, 'That they held it possible, and agreeable to nature, for one and the same body, for one and the same man, consisting of body and soul, which had been dissolved for many thousand years before, to be restored to life again.' But whereas they thought the conjunction of stars to be the full and total cause of sublunary effects, let us suppose God's will, or powerful ordinance, to be the sole cause of all things, and there will be no contradiction or impossibility in nature, why the selfsame men which have been, may not be again, albeit they had died more than five thousand years ago. For his will, as it is more powerful than

all the influence of stars, so is it more truly one and the same than any conjunction or aspect of stars can be; yea his will or his power was the true immediate or total cause of the matter of every thing, as well as of its form or soul; the true cause likewise of the conjunction of the soul and body.

6. It being then admitted that the Genethliaci did deny the immortality or perpetual duration of the reasonable soul, which to deny is a gross heresy in Christianity; yet this error in them was more pardonable by much, than the inference which some Christians make; who, holding the immortality of the soul, hold it withal to be an antecedent so necessary for evincing the future resurrection of the body, (or restauration of the same man who dies,) that if the soul were not immortal, there could be no resurrection of the body, no identical restauration of men that perish and are consumed to dust. They which deny the immortality of the soul do therefore *err because they know not the scriptures,* nor the will of God revealed in them concerning the state of the soul after death. For if the soul of Christ, as man, were (as we must believe it was) of the same nature that our souls are of, if his soul did not die with his body, our souls shall not die with our bodies.

Some Christians err as much as the Genethliaci.

Now Christ, at the very point of death, or dissolution of soul and body, did commend his soul into his Father's hands. And God the Father took a more special care of his soul, than either Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathæa did of his body. That God likewise did take the souls of the faithful into his custody at their departure from their bodies, our Saviour long before had taught us in his answer to the Sadducees, Matt. xxii. 31, 32: *As touching the resurrection of the*

dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. And as St. Luke addeth, chap. xx. 38, *all live unto him:* not always in their bodies, but always in their souls, which always expect a second conjunction or reunion to their proper bodies. And St. Stephen, when his persecutors did destroy his body, commends his soul into Christ's hands, as Christ had done his soul into the hands of his Father. So that no man can doubt of the immortality or perpetual duration of the soul, unless he be altogether ignorant of these and many like passages in the scriptures. But they which deny all possibility of the resurrection, or identical restauration of the same man to bodily life, (in case his soul were mortal, or might utterly cease to be with the body,) do err, not only out of ignorance of the scriptures, or of the will of God revealed in scriptures; but this their ignorance supposeth an ignorance or denial of *the power of God.* For God, who is *able out of stones to raise up children unto Abraham,* is no less powerful perfectly to restore the selfsame body and soul which now are, and really
427 to represent the selfsame man which now is, albeit both body and soul should, at his death, not only die, but be utterly annihilated; that is, although no more either of body or soul did remain after death, than was extant before the first creation of all things. Now before the first creation, there was not so much as a particle or least portion either of man's soul or body; for all things were created out of nothing; and all things might be created the same again that now they are, albeit they were by God's power, or by substraction of his influence, totally resolved into nothing.

7. All these propositions following are most true:

1. 'That as God did make all things of nothing, so he is able, if it should please him, to resolve all things into nothing.' This is essentially included in the article of omnipotency. Three principal propositions.

So is this second likewise; 'Although all things created were resolved into nothing, God is able to make them again the selfsame substances that they sometimes were, or now are.'

So likewise is this third; 'Albeit the bodies of men be not utterly resolved into nothing when they die, but into the elements of which they consist or are compounded, as into the earth, air, water, &c., yet every man's body, at the day of final appearance before our Judge, may be numerically the same that now it is.'

All these propositions are objectively possible, that is, they imply no contradiction in nature; and not implying any contradiction in nature, they are the proper objects of omnipotent power: that is, God is able to work all these effects in nature, which unto nature or natural causes are impossible. But that either the souls or bodies of men shall be annihilated, or resolved into nothing, we are not bound to believe; because the scripture doth nowhere testify God's will or purpose so to resolve them. Their annihilation or dissolution, their reproduction or reunion, merely depends upon the will or powerful ordinance of God. And albeit the resurrection of one and the same man may be demonstrated to be in nature possible, yet, that this possibility shall be reduced into act, that every man shall undoubtedly rise again in the body, to receive that which he hath done in his body, or with what manner of body for qualifications they shall arise, this cannot be taught by nature, but must be learned or believed from scripture.

To begin with the second proposition; 'Although all things created were resolved into nothing, God is able to make them again the selfsame numerical substances, that they sometime were, or now are.'

For proof of this proposition, I take as granted, That all things, which by creation took their beginning, had a true possibility of being numerically what they were, before they actually were: otherwise it was impossible for them actually to have been[f]. Now this possibility (allotted to every thing before it be) of being numerically what it is, or hath been, was not limited unto this or that set point or tract of time, but was of itself indifferent unto all times from eternity. All the coexistence which any thing created hath with this or that part of time, is not from any essential dependence which it hath on this or that time, but merely from the will or pleasure of the eternal Creator, who hath appointed to every thing a set time or season. The selfsame men which now are, might have been an hundred years ago; or, if their birth or production had been deferred till a hundred years after this present time, they might by their Creator's appointment be then the same men that now they are. Their actual being in this age doth not take away the possibility either of being before this time or after it: for possibility is perpetual, and at all times reducible into act, whensoever it shall
428 please the Creator to appoint or allot it actual being or existence[g]. The reduction of possibility into act (which is the perfection thereof) doth not prejudice or diminish the Creator's power of doing the like

[f] That there is a logical possibility presupposed to the working of God's power, see book 10. vol. ix.

[g] The bringing possibility into act doth not impair God's power, but shews the exercise of it, *pro hac vice*. See §. 9. [p. 251. of this volume.]

again; though the doing of it once makes it impossible that the doing it again should be the first time or turn of doing it. The omitting or forbearance to bring possibility into act, in the time past, doth not lapse it more than *pro illa vice.* It leaves us this possibility now truly to say, 'That which was not done a thousand years ago might have been then done, and the like or same may yet be done by the power almighty.' As every body endued with colour is always visible, though there be no eye present to look upon it (for it is therefore truly visible, in that any creature endued with sight may actually see it so often as it shall please to look upon it); so every thing which implies no contradiction in nature is always truly possible, and therefore eternally possible, because the Eternal may give it actual being or existence at all times, when it pleaseth him. This possibility is at all times the object of his omnipotent power, as visibility is of sight; and as whatsoever is visible may at all times be seen by a clear eye, so whatever is possible may at all times be done or made by God.

8. It is evident, that God by his power hath given all things, which now are or heretofore have been, actual being; that is, he hath created them. Creation is the making all things of nothing; annihilation is the reducing of any thing that hath been made into nothing. Both acts are proper only unto the omnipotent Creator. Suppose then some man or angel had been annihilated by his omnipotent power a thousand years ago, it is yet as possible for the same man or angel to be made again, as it was for him to be made at the first. And the reason is this; annihilation could take nothing from him, save only that which creation gave him. But creation only

These differ, as addition and substraction.

gave him actual being or existence; therefore annihilation only takes away actual being or existence, not the possibility of being, for that he had before he could be created. Seeing then creation did not give man or angel possibility of being, which was eternally included in the Creator's power, annihilation doth not dissolve or destroy this possibility, but leaves it only as creation found it. And whilst the possibility remains the same, it is still the same object of the same omnipotent power, and may as easily be reduced into act a thousand years hence, as it was in the first creation.

To make this problem more plain by demonstrating it upon a particular. Adam the first man was created upon the sixth day from the beginning of time, wherein the heavens and earth were made of nothing. Now no distinction of time, which did then begin to be, no secret power or virtue of time, (which is but a circumstance of things that are,) could either hinder or limit the Creator's power for creating of Adam upon the first day, or give any furtherance to his power for creating him upon the sixth day, rather than upon the twelfth or thirteenth day from the beginning of the creation. Admitting his creation had been deferred until the twelfth day, this deferring of his creation could have been no let or hinderance why he might not have been the selfsame man which was created the sixth day. As, if any man should cast a bullet in the same mould at twelve of the clock which he had purposed to cast at eight, but did defer the casting of it till that time, either upon pleasure, or interposition of other occasions, that delay would no way argue the bullet moulded at that time not to be the very selfsame which it would have been, if it had been cast four hours before, or four hours after.

The models of all things created, or possible to be created, are more certainly and more constantly con- 429
tained in the almighty Creator's power or wisdom, than any models which man can make are in man's power and skill. And so are all the creatures likewise more exactly answerable to the models contained in his power and wisdom, than any bullet or other materials can be to the mould wherein they are cast. Difference of time or delay of their production can breed no difference at all in the things produced, so long as every one is produced according to that exact model or exemplary form which it had in God from eternity. According to this pattern or model, the first man (as scripture tells us) was created upon the sixth day: suppose the same Creator had annihilated him upon the eighth day, this annihilation supposed, there is no impossibility or difficulty imaginable, why he might not upon the twelfth or thirteenth day have been created again the selfsame man he was upon the sixth day, seeing it was possible for God to have deferred his creation till that day, and yet to have created him the selfsame individual person that was created upon the sixth day.

9. Neither the exercise of God's almighty power in creating Adam upon the sixth day, nor the supposed exercise of the same power in annihilating him the eighth day, could breed any prejudice to the possibility of being created the selfsame man upon the twelfth or thirteenth day, which he had been from his first creation to his annihilation. Indeed to say, that Adam, being created the sixth day, and supposed to be annihilated upon the eighth day, and created again upon the twelfth or thirteenth day, should be then first created, would imply a contradiction. But it is one thing to say, there be two creations, another

to say, there be two distinct creatures, or two distinct substances created. A man might be twice created, and yet not be two distinct creatures, but numerically and identically one and the selfsame man which he was, as perfectly one and the selfsame man as if he had been but once created, or had continued from his creation without any interruption of his duration or existence. This implies no more contradiction in nature, than to say, that the king may create one and the same man twice earl or duke, or make him often the same magistrate. The office or dignity may be the selfsame, albeit there be some vacancy or interruption in the administration or duration of it. As if a man was deposed of his office and dignity at the end of the first year, and restored again at the end of the second year, this would imply a diversity of creation, or advancement, no diversity at all in the office or dignity unto which the same person is twice advanced. Now God's power over all his creatures, either utterly to annihilate them, or to interrupt them in their actual existence or duration, and to create them in the selfsame or better estate again, is far greater and more sovereign than any prince's civil power to advance or depose his subjects, or to restore them entirely to their former dignities. Admit then that God had resolved the first man Adam into nothing at the very first instant wherein he did eat the forbidden fruit, with purpose not to create him again until the last trumpet shall sound to judgment, the terror of that day should make as deep impression in him then first restored to life and sense again, as if he had suffered him to live but one day, and had called him at even unto judgment or a final accompt as terrible as in that last day it shall be to all that die in their sins. This whole time of vacancy or

cessation from actual being for almost six thousand years, would not have seemed so long to him at his resurrection, as a night passed over in a dead sleep is to a malefactor, which had murdered his father in the evening, and is drawn to the execution as soon as he awakes in the morning.

Thus much of God's power in general to raise up the selfsame men again, which have been long dead, or by supposition more than dead, utterly resolved 430
into nothing. Now if we must acknowledge it as an essential branch of the Almighty Creator's power to be able to raise up or create the selfsame men again, although they had been annihilated or turned to nothing, we must needs acknowledge it as a fruit or effect of the same power, to reunite every man's soul and body again at the last day; seeing the soul (as Christian faith doth teach us) doth still remain the same it was, the body being not utterly annihilated or consumed to nothing, but only resolved into dust, or into the elements of which it was first made. *Sed quomodo, inquis, dissoluta materia exhiberi potest? Considera temetipsum O homo, et fidem rei invenies. Recogita quid fueris antequam esses, utique nihil; meminisses enim, si quid fuisses. Qui ergo nihil fueras priusquam esses, idem nihil factus, cum esse desieris, cur non posses esse rursus de nihilo ejusdem ipsius Auctoris voluntate, qui te voluit esse ex nihilo? Quid novi tibi eveniet? qui non eras, factus es: cum iterum non eris, fies. Redde rationem, si potes qua factus es, et tunc require, qua fies. Et tamen facilius utique fies, quod fuisti aliquando, quia æque non difficile factus es, quod nunquam fuisti aliquando ..... Quæcunque te materia, destruxerit, hauserit, aboleverit, in nihilum prodegerit, reddet te; ejus est nihilum ipsum, cujus est*

totum. This is the sum of Tertullian's collections, Apolog. cap. 48.

10. This power of God to create man of nothing, and to create every one the selfsame man he was, albeit he had been annihilated or turned into nothing, the school divines of the Romish church acknowledge, and with great subtilty of wit and strength of argument prove, out of the article of God's omnipotency, unto which all possibility merely logical (or which implies no evident contradiction in nature) is always subject and obedient. But of this, as of most other orthodoxal doctrines or principles of faith, wherein we hold communion and consort with the Roman church, the modern advocates of that church, the Jesuits especially, make a very malicious and sinister use. The most learned amongst the modern Jesuits, being pressed by our writers with the gross absurdities and scandalous inconveniences which necessarily follow upon their doctrine of transubstantiation, or of Christ's local circumscriptive bodily presence in the blessed sacrament, fly to this doctrine of God's almighty power, whereby he is able to create one and the selfsame individual substance again and again, as oft as it pleaseth him, as to their last hold and refuge. Their only hope is, that this general doctrine being made plausible by them, they shall be able to make their quarrel just, not in itself, but upon expected advantage, if any of our writers should be so forward (as in divers other cases some have been too forward) to deny their antecedents, whenas they should traverse the inference or conclusions, which they labour with subtilty to infer from plausible and orthodoxal premises. Howbeit this antecedent, 'That God is able to create the selfsame man or bodily substance again and again, and as oft as it shall please him,' no

The Jesuit makes a sinister use of this truth touching the power of God.

protestant writer (to my observation) hath yet denied, none, as I hope, will ever deny. But such is our adversaries' confidence of Christ's promise to St. Peter, *I have prayed for thee, that thy faith shall not fail*, Luke xxii. 32, and of the pope's authority, as of Peter's pretended successor in this promise, that whatsoever doctrine the pope shall deliver *ex cathedra*, (as he hath done this doctrine of transubstantiation,) for a point of faith, they think God bound in justice to use his absolute and omnipotent power to make it true. For if the pope or the visible Romish church could possibly err in this or any other point of faith, God (by their doctrine) should fail in the performance of his former general promise, which undoubtedly he will not do, so long as he hath power to make his promise good, or to make the visible church's interpretations true and justifiable; to the preservation of whose in- 431
fallibility he hath (as they teach) bound himself by solemn promise.

11. But the question betwixt us and them concerning Christ's local or circumscriptive bodily presence in the sacrament, is not whether God can make one and the same body to be at one and the same time in divers places, or whether he can create one and the same body again in every hour, or in every place, as shall seem good to him, but whether it be his will to use this his power; or whether his will thus to do be so fully revealed in scripture, as that we are bound to believe that he doth or will make Christ's very body and blood to be locally present in every place where, and at all times when, that blessed sacrament shall be celebrated.

This we deny, and the former principle or antecedent, 'That God is able to create the selfsame body as often as it pleases him,' will never infer their in-

tended conclusion. Not to question what God can do, we further add, 'For Christ's body, or whole Christ God and man, to be bodily present by this means in many places at once, or in all places at all times wherein that blessed sacrament shall be celebrated, is one of those things, which, according to their rules as well as ours, cannot be done, as implying an evident contradiction in nature:' it may not be believed nor imagined, because God did never bind any man to believe such an impossibility or contradiction as is involved in this doctrine. It is altogether without the compass of the most miraculous work which God hath at any time wrought, or ever promised to work. All the former instances, or cases possible, concerning God's power to make one and the same man again after he had been annihilated, are most unlike to their intended conclusion. All the former instances or suppositions are free from all colour or suspicion of contradiction in nature. This supposed creation of Christ's body often since his death, implies as many and as manifest contradictions as there have been masses in the Romish church.

Not only these assertions, but the dissimilitude also of the case in question to the former cases will be immediately made clear from the very definition of *creation*. To create a body is to make it of nothing; and to make the selfsame body which formerly had been, but is resolved into nothing, out of nothing again, is but a second exercise of his creative power; and whatsoever God before hath done, he is able to do the same again. But the body of Christ they acknowledge to be immortal, and absolutely exempted, not only from annihilation, or resolution into nothing, but from all danger of corruption or diminution.

Again, whatsoever is created, whether at the first, second, or third time, hath no actual being until it begin to be by creation: now to make that very thing begin to be, or to begin to be out of nothing which already actually is, is something, is immortal, and more glorious than any other creature, implies a manifest contradiction. But Christ's body they grant to be immortal since his resurrection, more unalterable than the heaven of heavens, so immortal that it can never cease to be what it is; therefore it is impossible that it should begin to be by a new creation, or be created again: for that which is created, or may be created again, must first be resolved into nothing, or cease to be, before it can be created again, (seeing creation is the making of that which is not out of nothing,) or be made again by means miraculous. If then Christ's body be locally present in the sacrament, it must either be created again—and this supposeth either annihilation or dissolution of it—or else it must be brought out of the heavens into the priest's hands; or else the presence of it in many places must be created: but local presence is altogether uncapable of creation, for it is a mere relation which can neither be created nor made, but resulteth from or followeth 432
upon the motion (of things created) from one place to another, or from their creation or beginning to be in that place wherein they are said to be created.

12. So it fares with our adversaries in this argument, as it doth with boot-halers or night-riders which have caught an unlawful prey, being hotly pursued by the right owners. Now their manner is to divide the spoil and their company, that they may carry one part one way, and another part another way; that so whilst one is pursued, others may escape without pursuit or rescue of the prey. Through the ignorance or

carelessness of God's people, which should have kept a better watch over their own souls, the Romish priests had made a gainful prey by transporting the native sense of our Saviour's words in the institution of the sacrament to justify the doctrine of transubstantiation.

The several shifts of Romish writers to maintain their doctrine of transubstantiation.

And since they have been pursued by reformed writers, as cozeners and cheaters of God's people, some of them run one way, some another; some of them seek to maintain Christ's local presence, or transubstantiation, by the former doctrine of God's almighty power, which is able to create one and the same body often: others seek to maintain the same doctrine, and carry away the prey by the manner of angelical motion from one place to another in an instant or moment of time. And if they could draw such as pursue them into these straits and subtilties, they hope to make their part good against such as are not much conversant in the schoolmen's nice disputes concerning the nature or motions of angels, or know not the difference between the nature and motions of spirits and spiritual bodies. Others seek to maintain the same doctrine by the infinity of divisible quantities, (as if it were possible for a fly's wing to overspread the whole earth, as a hen doth her chickens,) and that Christ's body may, by this kind of infinity, be in many places at once, in as many as God shall appoint: hoping by this means to cast a mist before the eyes of such readers as know not the difference betwixt real material or substantial, and a mathematical or imaginary quantity. But all these fictions or suppositions they cast forth only to offer play unto their adversaries, or to gain some time for invention of new shifts. None of them dare pitch upon any or all of these ways or imaginations, or put the case upon this issue, whether any of them be in nature possible or agreeable to the

analogy of faith: the only point wherein they agree is the submission of their judgments or imaginations to the authority of the church; which is no better agreement, than if amongst a multitude of unlearned men, one of them should maintain that snow is white, another black, another pawn his estate that it is blue, and a fourth that it is green, and yet in the end refer themselves to be tried by some philosopher, which had written of the nature of snow in a language that none of them understands, whose books they know not where to find. For what the church is that cannot err, or of whom it consists, the French and Italian catholics do not agree. Or if we take the church for the Trent council confirmed by the pope, the Jesuits themselves cannot agree about the meaning of it in this point. Divers of them do in effect deny any transubstantiation in this sacrament, albeit that council under pain of curse enjoineth all Christians to believe, that there is a true conversion of the bread into the substance of Christ's body, and of the wine into the substance of his blood, and that this conversion is rightly called *transubstantiation:* so that in fine, the unity, whereof the children of that church do so much brag, is not an unity of faith or belief, but an unity of faction or conspiracy for their own gain; such as may be between the Jews, the Turks, the heathens, and the Arian heretics, which denied the divinity of Christ, 433
to rob or spoil the orthodoxal or true catholic Christians.

13. Most men have often read, all almost have often heard, of a twofold resurrection: the one, from death in sin unto newness of life; the other, from bodily death unto glory and immortality. The second resurrection is the end of our whole life here on earth; the first resurrection, from death in sin

to newness of life, is the mean most necessary for attaining this joyful and happy end. Now as the second resurrection, from bodily death unto glory, is the end of the first resurrection from sin to newness of life, so is the first resurrection the end of the blessed sacrament, or solemn commemoration of Christ's death till he come to judgment. And, although the omnipotent power of God, by which all things were created of nothing, be the most prime and powerful cause of the second resurrection, yet of our resurrection unto that glory and immortality, whereof Christ is now possessed, Christ, as man, is not only the ideal or exemplary, but the immediate efficient or working cause also: howbeit the power of his efficiency or working, as man, be derived from the omnipotent power of the Godhead dwelling in him bodily. But unto the real participation of this all powerful influence from Christ's humanity, by which the dead shall be quickened, by which these mortal bodies shall be clothed with glory and immortality, the bodily or local presence of Christ is not required by the Romish church. It doth not hold it necessary, that all or any body which shall be quickened or raised to glory, shall first swallow Christ's body, or be touched by it. Of angelical ministry or service, for gathering the dispersed relics of men's bodies, which have been dissolved by death, some use there shall be in the last day, as some Romanists with divers ancients think: but no use at all of any mass priest to make Christ's body to be locally present unto all that shall be quickened by it. There shall be no need then of transubstantiating sacramental bread into Christ's body, or wine into his blood, for giving life unto those that have been long dead, or for effecting that change which shall be wrought in the living.

Now, if by the mere virtual presence of Christ's body and blood, the men which have been long dead shall be restored to perfect life and immortality, shall not the souls of all, which receive him in the sacrament by faith and true repentance, be raised to newness of life by the same virtual presence, without any local touch of his body, but only by that sweet influence[h] which daily issueth from this Sun of righteousness, now placed at the right hand of God as in its proper sphere. This manner of Christ's presence, of his real presence in the sacrament, to wit, by powerful influence from his humanity, our church did never deny; nor doth God the Father or Christ the Son deny this real influence of life unto any that hunger and thirst after it in the sacrament.

CHAP. XIV.

1 CORINTH. XV. 35, &c.

But some will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die, &c.

That this argument, drawn from seed sown, is a concludent proof of the resurrection of the body.

THE questions are two: first, How the dead shall be raised? the second, With what bodies shall they come forth? The Corinthian naturalist's two curious questions.

The former imports thus much: How is it possible that the dead shall be raised? or, it being admitted 434
that it is possible for the dead in some sort or manner to arise to life, the next branch of the same question is, in what particular manner they shall *de facto* arise? as, whether by God's creative power, by which

[h] Of Christ's virtual influence, see book 10. chap. 55, 56. [vol. ix. pp. 586, 604.]

he made all things of nothing, or by his conservative power, by which he preserveth all things that are, in their proper being, or advanceth them to an higher estate or better tenure of being?

The second question or query is, With what kind of bodies shall the dead arise? whether with the self-same bodies wherein they died? or, if not every way the same, what alteration or change shall be wrought in them?

St. Paul's first answer to both questions.

Unto both these questions our apostle vouchsafeth but this one answer, Ἄφρον, σὺ ὃ σπείρεις, οὐ ζωοποιεῖται, ἐὰν μὴ ἀποθάνῃ· *O fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die.*

An objection against the answer in point of charity.

But this answer may seem in the first place to break the rule of Christian charity: for many of these Corinthians, though in this point of the resurrection erroneous and ignorant, were yet Christian, though weak brethren; and the law is general—*He that shall say unto his brother, Thou fool, shall be guilty of hell fire.* Matt. v. 22.

The answer to that objection.

The rule indeed is general, if this or the like opprobrious speech be hatched out of malice, leavened wrath, or inveterate hatred. But this sentence they do not incur out of whose mouths these or the like speeches issue by way of just reproof or instruction, as from a master to his scholars, or from a lord to his servants, in points wherein they err, and are to be corrected or instructed by him. In these cases, or upon these occasions, their censure passeth rather upon the folly than upon the persons of them whom they so chastise, correct, or seek to instruct. And it is not altogether impertinent, which some have noted upon that place, that our apostle's censure doth not aim at any particular or determinate person, but it is indefinitely directed to all those which seriously make the former

questions, either concerning the possibility of men's arising from the dead, or the particular manner how this resurrection should be wrought, or with what bodies they should come forth.

But many, such as will confess his reason or argument to be free from breach of Christian charity or good manners, will question the logical strength or pertinence of it. The strength or efficacy of it is questionable upon these points; as, first, how the daily experiment of seed corn, which first dies and is quickened again, can infer the fundamental conclusion by our apostle intended; to wit, the resurrection of men's bodies, which have been dead and rotten for many hundred years, and their relics dispersed into so many several elements or places, that if the seed corn which men sow were but dispersed into half so many places, the husbandman should in vain expect an increase, or his seed again. Secondly, admitting this yearly experiment of the seed dying and reviving were of force sufficient to enforce our belief of the former conclusion, that the bodies of men dead may be raised to life again, yet the manner or ground of his inference would be impertinent, if not contradictory to the principal conclusion intended by him, which we are bound explicitly to believe. For it is not enough to believe that the bodies of men which are committed to the grave shall not utterly perish, but be quickened again, (as the corn which is covered with the ground,) but we are bound further to believe, that every man shall arise with his own body, with the same very body wherein he lived, that he may receive his doom *according to that which he hath done in the body, whether it be good or bad.* This conclusion is not included in the apostle's inference or experiment drawn from the corn which groweth

A second objection in point of sufficiency.

out of the putrefied seed: for he expressly affirms, 1 Cor. xv. 37, that the body which springeth out of the ground is not the same seed that is sown.

435 2. In answer to the former difficulty, some good commentators there be which grant that our apostle's instance in the seed, which first dies and is afterwards quickened, is not a concludent proof or forcible reason, but rather a similitude or exemplification; and it is the property or character of similitudes or examples *illustrant, non docent*, they may illustrate the truth taught, they do not teach or confirm it. Tertullian and other of the fathers have divers illustrations or exemplifications of the resurrection in the course of nature; out of all which it would be hard to extract a full concludent proof. *Lux quotidie interfecta resplendet;* "The light daily vanisheth, and recovers brightness again;" darkness goes and comes by an interparallel course to the removal of light: *Sidera defuncta reviviscunt;* "The stars daily set, or fall, and rise again;" the seeds of vegetables do not fructify until themselves be dissolved and corrupted. All things sublunary are preserved by perishing, their reformation or renewing supposeth a defacing. Many of these and like observations, taken out of the book of nature, may serve as emblems or devices for emblazoning or setting forth our hopes or belief of the resurrection; but concludent proofs they cannot be, unless we grant that the book of nature hath, by God's appointment, types, or silent prophecies of divine mysteries, as well as hath the book of grace. But shall we say or believe that the apostle's inference in this place is only emblematical or allegorical? or rather a physical or metaphysical concludent proof? a proof, not only against such as acknowledge the truth of the Old Testament, or

The answer to this objection.

written word of God, but a proof (so far as it concerns the possibility of a resurrection) contained in the book of nature? His conclusion, he supposeth, might by observant readers be extracted out of the instance or experiment which he brings: for unless out of the instance given in the corn, which first dies and afterwards is quickened, the possibility of the resurrection, of such a resurrection as he taught, might concludently be proved; they which doubted of, or denied this truth, had not incurred the censure of folly, they had not deserved the title or name of *fools*. But not to be able to read that which was legible in their own books, that is, in the works of nature, was a childish folly; a folly which, in men of years and discretion, could not proceed but from insufferable incogitancy or negligence. If we examine the apostle's inference, according to the rules of true philosophy, which never dissents from true divinity, his instances are concludent, his argument is an argument of proportion, *a majore ad minus*, "from the greater to the less." All the difficulty is in framing or setting the terms of it aright.

Exceptions against the proof.

3. All the exceptions which are taken against his proof are reducible to this one general head: That he argues, or makes his inference, from the works of nature unto a work supernatural; or from the generation of vegetables ordinary in the course of nature, unto the resurrection of our bodies, which can be no work of nature, no generation, but a work as supernatural as creation. But they which thus object, should consider that those works which we term *works of nature*, (as generation of vegetables, the increase of the earth, the fruit of trees, and the like,) are not in our apostle's philosophy any way opposite to the works of God, or to works mira-

The exceptions answered.

culous and supernatural. This proposition is in his divinity and in true philosophy most certain: 'Whatsoever nature works, God doth work the same:' and he works the same immediately, though not by himself alone; for nature worketh with him, though immediately by him. But the former proposition is not convertible; that is, we cannot say, 'That God works nothing without the coagency of nature;' as we say, 'That nature worketh nothing without the cooperation or power of God.' Nature worketh nothing, cannot
436 possibly work, without the power and direction of God; God worketh many things since the world was made by him, or nature created by him, without the association or cooperation of nature, or any causes natural. And the works which he worketh by himself alone, either without the association or interposition of causes natural, or contrary to the ordinary course of nature, are properly called works miraculous or supernatural; and miraculous they are called, not because they always argue a greater or more immediate exercise of God's power, than is contained in the works of nature, but in that they are unusual, and without the compass of ordinary observation. Sometimes those works which are truly miraculous may less participate of the Almighty power, than the usual works of nature do. It was a true miracle that the sun should stand still in the vale of Ajalon; but not therefore a miracle in that it did argue a greater manifestation of God's power than is daily manifested in the course of nature, or works of other creatures, but a great miracle only in that it was so rare and unusual. The daily motion of the sun about the earth, if we search into the true and prime causes of it, includes a greater measure or more branches of the Almighty Creator's power, than the

Works truly miraculous may have a less share of God's power than usual works of nature.

standing still of the sun did in the days of Joshua, or the going back of it did in the days of Hezekiah. For in our apostle's divinity, Acts xvii. 28, *we live, and move, and have our being* in God; that is, all things that are have their being in him and from him; their being is but a participation of his infinite being. The life of all things living, is but a participation or shadow of his life; the motion of all things that move, is but the participation of his power: so that when the sun did cease to move or stand still in the days of Joshua, it was partaker only of his power sustentative, or of that power by which he supporteth all things; it ceased to move only by mere substraction or cessation of his motive power, by whose virtue or influence it daily, like a giant, runs his course. Thus daily to run its course it could not without a positive force or power communicated unto it from the Creator, in whom (as the apostle speaks) it moves. But it ceased for a while to move, without any positive force or power to inhibit or restrain its course, but, as we said, by mere substraction of that power by which it moves. So long as it continues its course, it both moves and hath its being in God, and it is partaker of two branches of his almighty power: but when it stood still, it only had its being in him. The influence of the other branch of power was intercepted. Now the argument drawn from those works which we call *the works of nature*, unto works miraculous or supernatural, would in this case hold *a majore*. He that daily makes the sun to compass the world, is able to stay its course when he pleaseth.

4. A miracle likewise it was, and a great one too, that the three children should be untouched in the midst of the flaming furnace: yet neither was there a

greater nor more immediate positive effect of God's power in the restraint of that fire then, than was in the sustaining other fire, which at other times devoured the bodies of his saints, the holy martyrs, who loved not their lives unto the death, but gave them up for the testimony of the Lord Jesus: for, without the cooperation or concourse of God's power, the fire could not have touched their bodies. Wherein then did the miracle recorded in Daniel, and experienced in the three children, properly consist? Not so much, if at all, in fencing their bodies from the violence of the flame, by imposition or infusion of any new created quality into their bodies, as in substracting or withdrawing his ordinary cooperation from the fire, whose natural property is to consume or devour bodies combustible, such as the bodies of the three
437 children by nature were. The only cause why the fire did not burn them was the substraction or withdrawing of God's cooperative power, without whose strength or assistance the hottest furnace that art or experience can devise, cannot exercise the most natural operation of fire. For as the substance of the fire cannot subsist, or have any place in the fabric of this universe, unless it be supported by God's power sustentative, so neither, whilst it subsists, or hath actual being amongst God's creatures, can it work or move without the assistance of God's cooperative or all-working power. In him both these powers are one; both, as he is, are infinite: but as communicated unto his creatures they are not altogether one, but two participated branches of his infinite power. And in the burning of the martyrs, or in other destructions made by fire, both branches, as well of his sustentative as of his cooperative power, are manifested; whereas in the preserving of the three children from

the violence of the flaming furnace, the one branch only, to wit, his power sustentative, was communicated to the fire; the other branch, to wit, the participation of his cooperative or working power, was, for the time being, lopped off from the body or substance of the fire. Now this withdrawing of his cooperative power from the fire was a true document or proof that he is the God and Guide of nature; that without him the fire, even whilst it is for nature and substance most complete, cannot perform the proper work or exercise of its nature. The necessary consequence of which proof or experiment is this; that he is the author or fountain as well of all the works or exercises of natural causes, as of natural bodies or substances themselves. And if we consider his power, not in itself, but as communicated to his creatures or natural agents, it is and ought to be acknowledged greater in those works which we call works of nature, and of which we have daily experience, than it was in either of these two miracles before mentioned. Both of them were for this reason only miraculous, in that they were most unusual, and without the circuit of any experiment or observation in the course of nature before the times wherein they happened.

5. To raise men's bodies out of the grave, or out of the elements into which they have been dissolved, is far more unusual than to raise up corn out of putrefied seed; and in this respect the resurrection, which we hope for, must be acknowledged a work more miraculous and wonderful, than the yearly springing of corn, of fruits, of herbs, or grass. But may we say in this case as in the former, that *the power of God* is no less, but rather greater, in these ordinary works of nature, (as in causing herbs, fruit,

or corn, to sprout or fructify with advantage of increase,) than it shall be in the resurrection of the dead; which is a work, not of nature, but miraculous and supernatural—a work in which natural causes shall not be entertained nor employed by God? No; there shall be a manifestation of greater power, than either of God's sustentative power, by which all things that were created are still preserved, or of his cooperative power, without whose participation nothing which is so preserved can work at all, or perform the exercises of its proper nature. The power indeed, by which he preserveth all things, is the selfsame power, by which he made all things out of nothing. The preservation of things that are, is but a continuation or proroguing of the first creation. As all things are made of nothing, so would they instantly return into nothing, were they not continually supported and preserved by the selfsame power, by which they begun to be, when they were not. Creation and preservation differ only *in sensu connotativo*, only in relation, not in substance. Creation includes a negation of being
438 before; for all things that are, took their beginning by creation. Conservation supposeth a beginning of things that are, and includes a negation of their returning into nothing. These two negations being abstracted or sequestered, the creation of all things and their conservation, are as truly and properly the same power or work of one and the same party, as the way from Athens to Thebes and from Thebes to Athens is the same.

But if the continuation of things that are be a creation, or if the selfsame almighty power be still manifested in the preservation of things temporal, that was manifested in the first creation, what greater

power can be manifested in the resurrection from the dead, than is daily manifested, and ought to be acknowledged, in the preservation and daily increase of herbs, of fruits, of corn sown, and springing out of the earth? Or if any greater power shall be manifested in the resurrection from the dead, than is daily experienced in these works of nature, how shall we justify our apostle's argument in this place to be an argument of proportion, or an argument (as we said before) from the greater to the less, or an argument *a pari*, from the like case or instance? The argument indeed would directly follow, 'He that is able to make men live again, that have been dead for a thousand years, is also able to quicken the corn in the next month which died the last month.' This kind of argument would be as clear, as if you should say, 'That he that is able to make ready payment of a thousand pounds, may soon and easily pay a hundred.' But you would take it as an impertinent or indiscreet allegation to say, 'I know this man is able to pay you a hundred pounds, therefore I would persuade you to take his bond for a thousand.' But our apostle's argument in this place may seem less probable, and it is, at least to appearance, but thus; 'God daily raiseth up corn within a year after it is sown; *ergo*, he shall raise up Adam's body, which was consumed to dust five thousand years ago.'

6. To frame the apostle's argument, which is an argument of proportion, aright, you must take his principles or grounds into your consideration. Now he first supposeth, and takes it (as all good Christians ought to do) for granted, that God doth give that body unto every seed with which it ariseth or cometh out of the ground. The increase of things sown or planted, is not, in his language or philosophy, the mere

effect or gift of nature; for even nature herself, or whatsoever she hath to bestow, is the gift of God. That which philosophers call *nature* is in true divinity nothing else but the law which God hath set to things natural, or subject to change or motion. Now he which made this law, whether for guiding bodies sublunary or celestial, can dispense with it at his pleasure. He sometimes inhibits the ordinary course of the law of nature by substraction, as it were, of his royal assent, or by suspending the concurrence of his operative power; and sometimes again he advanceth the state of things natural, by creating or making a new law unto the manner of their being, or of their operations; that is, he changeth their qualities, though not their natures or essences. Thus much presupposed or premised, our apostle's inference is as firm and strong as it is emphatical: *Stulte! tu quod seminas .... O fool, that which* THOU *sowest is not quickened, except it die*, &c. The force or emphasis may be gathered thus: 'If God doth give a body unto that seed which thou sowest for thine own use and benefit, much more will the same God give a body to the seed which he himself doth sow, much more will he quicken it after it hath been dead; seeing the end why he sows it, is not thy temporal benefit or commodity, but his own immortal glory.'

439 When God did enact that severe law, from which death natural takes its original, *Dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return;* the intent or purport of that law was not, that man by returning to dust should utterly or finally perish, and be for ever as if he never had been. What then was the intent or purport of this law? That man's body should be committed unto the earth, as seed is committed to the ground; that as the corn which springs out of the earth returns to earth

again, and is still raised up with advantage and increase unto the sower: so the bodies of men, after that by the first man's folly they became corruptible, and certain to suffer corruption, (whether in the earth, in the air, or in the sea,) might be raised again, but not to corruption, that God may receive the seed which is sown with increase of glory to himself; this increase of glory being rooted in the increase of their happiness by whose immortality he is immediately glorified. Thus much of the former difficulty, to wit, how our apostle's instance or experiment in the work of nature doth infer his intended conclusion, to wit, the future resurrection from the dead. And from the solution of this former, the second may easily be assoiled.

7. The second difficulty was, How this instance or experiment of the corn dying and being quickened again can fit or parallel the resurrection of the body, seeing the corn which is quickened or springeth up is not the same body which was sown? whereas it is a point of our belief, that the same numerical bodies which die and return to dust, or are resolved into ashes, or into the elements of which they consist, shall be raised up at the last day. For if the body raised up were not the selfsame that died, the body which died should not be partaker either of pain or joy everlasting, but another body should be tormented or glorified instead of the body which died; every man should not receive reward or punishment *according to that which he had done in the body;* or at least this reward or punishment should not be received in the same body in which he had done ill or well.

The second difficulty urged.

Aquinas, a great schoolman in his time, labours to assoil the proposed difficulty, by framing the apostle's argument thus: "If nature can repair that which

Aquinas' solution true, but impertinent.

dies, *idem specie*," that is, "if nature can make it to be of the same kind it was, though not the same numerical body it was," (as he that sows wheat reaps wheat, not rye or barley, though not the selfsame grains of wheat which he sows,) then "the God of nature and Creator of all things shall raise up the bodies of men, which are his seed and proper husbandry, the very selfsame which they were, not the selfsame for kind or specifical unity, but the same individuals." Of all the bodies which have died, not one shall miscarry, not so much as a hair of any man's head, or any least part of his body, shall finally perish.

But though all this be true, yet is it impertinent, it falls not within the compass of our apostle's inference in this place, who neither affirms nor denies, nor took it so much as into his consideration, whether the corn which springs up be the same individual nature or substance which did putrefy and die in the ground. The utmost circumference of his considerations or thoughts extends no further than thus; 'That the body which God doth give to every seed is not for quality the same which was sown; for it was sown bare corn without blade, husk, or ear, and loseth that corpulency or quantity which it had: but it springs not up bare corn.' The new life, which it gets in the womb of the earth, is clothed with a fresh body, capable of nourishment and growth; of both which it was uncapable whilst it was severed from the ear wherein it grew, or after the stalk was cut down. And this change or alteration in the corn sown and springing up, doth well fit the change or alteration which shall be wrought in our bodies at the resurrection, or last day. Our bodies by death become more uncapable of nourishment than the corn severed from the ear or cut down; for they are utterly

The author's solution of the former difficulty.

deprived of life, of sense, of motion, in all the interim between the day of their dissolution and the last day. By the resurrection they shall not only recover life, sense, and motion, but the life which they get shall be endowed with immortality; the bodies shall be clothed with glory.

This change of our mortal bodies into immortal is much greater than the most plentiful increase which any seed doth yield. One seed or grain may in some soils bring forth thirty, in others sixty, in others a hundred; but immortality added to the life of the body, is an increase in respect of this mortal life which now we lead, inexpressible by any number. The life of Methuselah is not comparable to it, albeit the years which he lived on earth were multiplied by the days contained in them, and both multiplied again by all the minutes and scruples contained in the days and years which he lived. And yet after this increase of life our bodies shall be the same they were, for nature and essence, but not the same for qualities or capacities, whether of joys or pains. In these respects they shall differ far more than any corn growing doth from the seed from which it springs. And this difference of qualities, between the bodies which die and shall be raised again, was all that our apostle sought or intended to illustrate or set forth by that similitude which he useth—*Thou sowest not the corn which shall be;* that is, not the same corn for quantity, for quality, for vigour of life: nor shall men's bodies be raised again to such a life only as they formerly had, or to such a corruptible estate as that wherein death did apprehend them, but to a life truly immortal.

8. The second question proposed by the Corinthian

The Corinthian naturalist's second question.

naturalist was, 'With what bodies shall the dead come forth or appear?' And the direct answer to this question is included in the former similitude, (so much insisted on before, as that it needs not to be repeated here:) the effect of it is this; That they shall come forth with bodies much more excellent than those with which they descended into the grave.

The answer to this question.

And of this general answer, included in the similitude of the corn, or seed sown, all the exemplifications following, unto verse 45, are native branches:

39. *All flesh is not the same flesh: but there is one kind of flesh of men, another flesh of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds.*

40. *There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another.*

41. *There is one glory of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory of the stars: for one star differeth from another star in glory.*

42. *So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption:*

43. *It is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness; it is raised in power:*

44. *It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body*, &c.

Thus much of the positive force of our apostle's argument, drawn from the similitude of the corn, which by the law of nature must die before it be quickened and receive increase.

9. But of this similitude it is no native branch or part, whether the corn which dies being sown, do rise
441 again the next year, for vital substance or life, the same which it was whilst it was contained in the

blade or ear the year before; certainly it is not the same for corpulency, for matter or quantity. But whether the seeds of life or spirit of corn do not remain the same by continuation, though in divers bodies or matter, our apostle disputes not, nor do I dispute. This is a curiosity which cannot be determined in the pulpit without appeal unto the schools. The vital spirit or essence of the corn may be so far the same in the corn which is sown, and which is reaped, that if we should, for disputation sake, suppose or imagine what some have dogmatically affirmed, to wit, that the corn sown were endowed with sense or feeling, were capable of pleasure or pain; the pleasure which it formerly enjoyed might be renewed, increased or multiplied, with increase or multiplication of its bodily substance; so might the pain, which it had felt before it was sown, be renewed and increased after it were quickened again, if any sort of corn were appointed, as some men are, to torture and punishment. Now albeit we must believe that men's bodies after the resurrection shall be the very same for substance which they were before death, yet are we not bound to believe that they shall be any further the same, than that every man which died in his sins may in his body feel an infinite increase of those miseries which he had deserved, and in some sort felt whilst he lived on earth; or that every man at the last day may reap an infinite increase of those joys and comforts, of which in this life he had some tastes or pledges, whilst he sowed unto the Spirit. For, as the apostle elsewhere speaks, *he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption;* a full crop of all the miseries incident to mortality, but miseries more than mortal, miseries everlasting and never dying: and he that in this life soweth unto the Spirit, shall, at the resurrection,

of the Spirit reap life, but a life immortal, without end, without annoyance, or interruption of joy.

Again, they extend the former similitude too far, which from it would gather, that as there is a natural force or previal disposition in the corn sown, by which, as by a secondary cause or instrumental mean, it is quickened and increased, so there be natural seeds of life in the putrefied relics of men's bodies, or remnants of the matter dissolved, out of which life immortal shall so spring, as the blade doth out of the seed which is sown, only by the sustentative or operative power of God, by which all things are supported, or enabled to produce their natural effects. For although it be true that the works which we ascribe to nature are wrought by God, or by continuation of the same power by which they were first created and set a working, yet the resurrection of men's bodies shall not be wrought by the mere continuation of this power; there must be more than a conservation of their matter, more than an usual cooperation with the elements out of which they are raised, there must be even a new creation of their bodies; yet not a creation of them out of nothing, but out of the scattered fragments of their matter; such a creation as the works of the fifth and sixth day were, when God commanded the sea or water to bring forth fishes in their kind, and the earth to bring forth trees or plants in their kind. These were not effects[k] of nature, or of that power only by which the sea and earth were from the first day preserved; but here was a new creation, out of that which philosophers properly term *the mater;* that is, the common mother of generation or corruption. And thus God at the last day shall command, not the earth only, but the sea also, with the other elements, to give up their dead, Rev. xx. 13.

[k] See book 10. [vol. ix. pag. 227, &c.]

Lastly, they extended this similitude too far, which hence imagined, that as the corn often dies, and is often quickened, and dies again, so, by the doctrine of Christians, there should be a death after the resur- 442
rection, and a resurrection after death, or such a continual vicissitude between life and death as is between light and darkness.

This objection is punctually resolved by Tertullian, in the 48th chapter of his Apology. The sum of his answer is; "That so it might be, if the omnipotent Creator had so appointed; for he is able to work this continual interchange, or vicissitude of life and death, as well in men's bodies as in the bodies of corn sown or reaped; or as he doth the perpetual vicissitude of light and darkness in the two hemispheres of the world; but he hath revealed his will to the contrary." And the reason is not the same (but rather contrary) in God's crop or harvest, as it is in the crops or harvests of mortal men: as men in this life are mortal, so is their food or nutriment; and for this reason their nutriment must be supplied by continual sowing and reaping. But God's is immortal, and so shall the crop of his harvest be. Our resurrection from the dead is his general crop or harvest; and this needs to be no more than one, because our bodies being once raised up to life again shall never die, but enjoy immortality in his presence. Heaven is his granary, and what is gathered into it cannot perish or consume.

10. The general use of this doctrine is punctually made to our hands by our apostle, 1 Cor. xv. 58: *Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord.* And more particularly 1 Thess. iv. 13, The general use of this doctrine.

&c.: *I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope,* &c. The apostle there doth not forbid all mourning for the dead, but the manner of mourning only, that they mourn not as they which have no hope, no expectation of any resurrection after death. Nature will teach us, as it did these Thessalonians, to mourn for the death of our friends and kindred. And our belief of this article will give us the true mean, and prescribe the due manner or measure of mourning. Our sorrow, though natural and just, yet if it be truly Christian, and seasoned with grace, will still be mingled with comfort and supported by hope. To be either impatient towards God, or immoderately dejected for the death of our dearest friends, whose bodies God hath in mercy committed to the custody of the earth, of the sea, or other elements, is but a symptom of heathenish ignorance (or infidelity) of this article, a barbarism in Christianity.

If we of this land should live amongst barbarians, whom we had taught to make bread of corn, and accustomed to the taste of this bread as unknown to their forefathers, as manna at first appearance was to the Israelites, but not acquainted them with the mystery of sowing and reaping, they would be as ready in their hunger or scarcity of bread to stone us, as the Israelites were to stone Moses in their thirst, if they should see us offer to bury that corn in the earth with which their bowels might be comforted: yet if they were but so far capable of reason as to be persuaded, or we so capable of trust or credit with them as to persuade them, that there were no possibility left, either to have bread without supply of corn, or for corn to increase and multiply, unless

it did first die and putrefy in the ground; hope of a more plentiful crop or harvest would naturally incline them to brook the present scarcity with patience, and to be thankful towards such as would so carefully provide for them.

Now, besides that the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, the committing of their bodies to the grave is but as a solemn preparation of seed for a future crop or harvest. If in these premises we do rely and trust in God, our sorrow and heaviness for the dead, 443
though it may endure for a while, will be swallowed up in comfort; our mournful tears and weeping will be still accompanied with praises and thanksgiving unto Him, that hath so well provided for them that live in his fear and die in his favour.

11. But as this doctrine administereth plenty of comfort in respect of friends deceased, so it should move us to make choice of such only for our dearest friends, as we see inclined to live in the fear of the Lord. Or if we have prevented ourselves and this advice in making such choice, yet let us never be prevented by others for making the main and principal end of our friendship or delight in any man's company to be this;—a serious study and endeavour to prepare others, and to be prepared by them, to live and die in the Lord. As there is no greater comfort in this life, than a faithful and hearty friend, so can no greater grief befall a man at the hour of death, than to have had a friend trusty and hearty in other offices and services, but negligent and backward in cherishing the seeds of faith, of love, or fear of the Lord, or other provision of our wayfare towards the life to come. No practice of the most malicious, or most inveterate, or most provoked foe, can breed half so much danger to any man, as the affectionate intentions of a carnal

Christians should choose such friends as have share in the first, and hopes of the second resurrection.

friend, always officious to entertain him with pleasant impertinences, which will draw his mind from the fear and love of God, and either divert or effeminate his cogitations from resolute pitching upon the means and hopes of a joyful resurrection to everlasting life.

Even to minds and affections already sweetened with sure hope of that life to come, what grief must it needs breed in this life, if he be a loving husband, to think he shall be by death eternally divorced from the company of his dearest consort! or if he be an affectionate friend, to consider that the league of mutual amity in this life (never interrupted, but secured from danger of impairment, whilst their pilgrimage lasts here on earth) should be everlastingly dissolved after the one had taken up his lodging in the dust; that all former dearest kindness should not only be forgotten, but be further estranged from performance of any common courtesy, than any Christian in this life can be, in regard of any Jew or Turk, or any Jew or Turk from them! For what Jew or Turk is there that would not be ready to relieve a Christian with some offals from his table, whom he sees ready to pull the flesh off his own arms to satiate hunger? yet this is more than the most loving husband may do unto his dearest wife—than a father may wish to his son—or any friend that dies in the Lord may do unto another after death, unless they both repair to one home, and be not divided by that gulf which was set between Dives and Lazarus.

You know the story, how that Lazarus was not permitted to minister so much as a drop of water unto Dives to cool his tongue. Nor shall the father, which dies in the Lord, be permitted to do or wish so great a kindness unto the son, nor the husband to the wife, which live and die in their sins. What remedy

then can be prescribed for preventing the just occasions of this grief, but that husband and wife, father and son, mother and daughter, and others, linked in any bond of love and friendship, do mutually labour to wean each other's affections from earth and earthly things, and each lend other their helping hand to fasten their *affections on things that are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God!*

CHAP. XV. 444

The Objections of the Atheist, and the Exceptions of the Naturalist, both put fully home, and as fully answered. The Falsity of the Supposals and Paradoxes (rather than Principles) of the Atheist discovered, and made even palpable by ocular Demonstration, and by Instances in Bodies vegetant and sensitive. A Scruple, that might trouble some pious Mind, after all this, satisfied. A short Application of the Doctrine contained in the whole Chapter.

1. BUT here the atheist will except, 'That the former reasons are concludent only in case the whole substance or bodily part of man be annihilated.' That indeed which is annihilated, is as if it had never been, and is as capable of creation as it was at the first, or at the time when it was nothing; for creation makes that to be which is not; and that is most properly said to be created, which is made of nothing, or without any matter or stuff preexistent. But thus it is not in the bodies of men that are dead; these are not annihilated, or resolved into nothing: the matter of them still remaineth, though not in the same place or shape, but some part of it in this body, some part in that. The atheist's exception.

Of a man's body which died twenty years ago, some part is changed or transformed into the nature of earth—some part resolved into vapours or exhalations —some part into grosser moisture, whereof other live

creatures are produced: no part of it returns into mere nothing. Whatsoever bodily substance hath been by God created out of nothing, hath all its relics one where or other still remaining; and the very least fragment of the meanest of them is a great deal more than nothing.

The naturalist's demand.

And here the subtle naturalist coming in, demands, 'What possibility can be conceived, that the selfsame bodies, which were consumed a thousand years ago, should be entirely restored again?'

This supposed restauration must either be by a new creation, or it must be only by a recollection or gathering together of the relics or matter which have been dispersed and scattered through divers places, and transformed into so many several bodies.

2. That the bodies which have been dissolved, should at the last day be made the selfsame they were by a new creation, (properly so called,) seems impossible: for every body must have its proper and immediate matter, and no body can be created without the creation of such a matter. The soul of man may be created in the body without creation of the matter whereto it is annexed, because the soul is no material substance; but the creation of a bodily or material substance essentially includes a creation of the matter, and this matter may be either created before the compound, into which it is afterward formed, (as the body and matter of the first man was created out of the earth, before it was wrought by the breath of God into a living or sensitive substance,) or this matter may be concreated with the body or compound whose matter it is.

Thus the fishes in the sea and the plants in the earth were each of them created by one entire creation; there was not one creation of their proper matter, and

another of their proper form. The bulks or stems of trees were not made or created out of the earth before the vegetable or vital faculty was infused into them; both were made at once.

The several branches of the difficulty in this argument may be framed thus: If the bodies of men which have been resolved into dust (perhaps into as many several bodies as there be men now living) must all be created again, and every one created again the self-same it was, then either the matter must be the self-same which it was, or else it must have some new matter equivalent, or of the selfsame use or service in respect of the soul, unto which the former matter had been, and this new matter (not altogether the same, but the same by equivalency) is, or is to be, united. 445 The naturalist's objections framed into a body.

That the selfsame matter which was in a man's body when he died should become the same again by a new creation *ex nihilo*, implies a contradiction; for that very material substance which was in Adam at his death is not to this day annihilated, not the least scrap or fragment of it but is now existent in some body or other. And that which at this very hour actually is, or existeth in some other body, cannot at this very hour begin to be, cannot at this very hour be made of nothing, because itself already is something. If the matter of Adam's body (which we suppose not to be utterly annihilated) could be created again whiles it so continues, it should be existent and not existent, it should begin to be and not begin to be, at the same point of time[1]. Both which imply a manifest contradiction; and all contradictions, though in matters merely speculative, are as contrary to the unity and truth of the Godhead, as dissimulation, fraud

[1] See chap. 13. §. 11. [p. 255. of this volume.]

or cozenage are to the holiness of God. To make both parts of a contradiction true, falls not under the object or exercise of his almighty power.

It is the very nature of the matter not to be *unum et idem.*

If then the body of Adam cannot be created the same it was, unless the selfsame matter whereof his body was first made be restored, it is clear that the selfsame matter cannot be entirely restored by creation, unless those bodies wherein it is be first annihilated, or turned into nothing; for whilst they remain something, or rather whilst the matter which was in Adam remaineth in them, the same matter being something in them, cannot properly be created again, or begin to be out of nothing.

The answer to the naturalist's objections.

3. But that the body of Adam should be at the last day the same it was when he died, by recollecting or putting together the selfsame material parts whereof his soul was possessed at her departure from the body, is not impossible. That the bodies of all men should at the resurrection become the same they were by this means, not by creation of new bodies, or by new creation of any bodily substance or new matter out of nothing, the heathens (it seems) did conceive to be the opinion of the ancient Christians when the gospel of Christ (concerning the resurrection of the body) begun to be pressed and preached among them. For to disprove Christians' belief of this article, or at least to defeat Christians of their hopes of a bodily resurrection to a better life, their heathen persecutors did burn their bodies unto ashes, and afterwards sow their ashes, some in the waters[m], some in the air, or expose them to the blasts of boisterous winds; hoping by these practices to find the God of these Christians a

[m] See the epistle of the churches of Vienna and Lyons to the brethren of Asia and Phrygia, in Euseb. Hist. book 5. chap. 1. *ad fidem.*

cumbersome work, before he could accomplish what they professed he had promised unto them concerning the resurrection of the same bodies, and of rendering to every soul the same material portions, whereof it was sometimes seized. But whether the malicious heathens did punctually oppose these practices unto the assertions of the Christians, as if from their mouths they had heard that the resurrection of the body should be accomplished by recollection of all the particles into which it had been resolved, (through what elements soever they had been in long tract of time dispersed,) or whether these heathens did thus practise upon the Christians' bodies out of their own imaginations, as not conceiving any other means possible by which every man might arise with his own body, I find not upon record.

446 There is much good morality to be learned from the contemplating the mixtures and separation of metals.

Some of the ancient fathers, in their arguments against the heathen, or in their apologies for this article of our faith, suppose the resurrection of the body shall be accomplished by the recollection of the relics or fragments into which each one's body hath been dissolved; and to this purpose use divers similitudes or illustrations drawn from goldsmiths or refiners of metals, who by their art or mystery can extract the fragments of gold or silver out of any other metal or body with which they are mingled. Howbeit other of the fathers, and sometimes the same fathers, which use these similitudes or illustrations, principally rely upon God's creative power, by which he made all things out of nothing, or by which he multiplieth or advanceth things that have some actual being unto a more excellent and more plentiful kind of being.

It was an exercise of the creative power to turn water (in an instant) into wine; to multiply *five loaves*

and two fishes unto the sustentation of more than *five thousand men,* besides the fragments remaining, which were ten times more than the provision itself. And in thus resolving the possibility of every man's rising with his own body into the power of God, whereby he is able either to make all things out of nothing, or to make one thing out of another by means miraculous, and far surmounting all force of natural agents, the ancient fathers did wisely. For admitting (what no Christian can deny) that God's skill or knowledge to recollect all the several parcels of every man's body (which way soever dispersed) doth infinitely exceed the most exquisite skill of any mineralist or refiner in severing one metal from another, and in wedding and uniting every parcel, fragment, or remnant, of what kind soever, with others of its own kind; yet this infinite skill or knowledge in recollecting or uniting the several parts of men's bodies, which have been dissolved by death, could not suffice to the supportance of that truth, which in this article we all believe, against the assaults of the atheists, unless this infinite skill or knowledge were seconded with an infinite creative power.

The atheist's wily (but not wise) objection against the possibility of a resurrection by recollection of relics.

4. Against the recollection of all the relics or fragments of men's bodies, the atheist or subtle naturalist would thus object: 'All Christians do not die a natural death; all come not to the sepulchres of their fathers; many perish in the sea; and the bodies of many which thus perish are quite devoured by fishes, sea-monsters, or other inhabitants of the sea; and the fishes which thus devour even Christian men are again devoured by other men, and those men again which have fed on fishes which devoured men become a prey unto other fishes, and these fishes are taken again and eaten by men; the men that eat

these fishes may' (says he, and we may suppose they do) 'become a prey unto the cannibals, a barbarous and monstrous people, which feed as greedily upon man's flesh, as any sea-monster or ravenous land creature would feed on theirs. Now the matter or bodily substance of every man that is devoured by fishes, or other inhabitants of the sea, is turned into the matter or bodily substance of the devourer. The matter again of every fish that is eaten by man is converted or changed into the matter or substance of that man which eats it. The cannibal would not so greedily feed upon man's flesh as he doth, unless he were truly nourished by it; and nourishment is the conversion of the matter or substance eaten into the matter or substance of him that eateth it.'

Now if the resurrection of every man with his own body, with the same body from which his soul was by death divorced, did only or principally consist in the recollection or reunion of the same material parts or relics which were dissolved by death, it would be a hard point to resolve or satisfy the atheist, or incredulous naturalist, how it were possible that every man should have the selfsame body that he had at the hour of death.

To twist the difficulty harder, according to the atheist's suppositions (which are not impossible, nor in ordinary conjecture improbable): 447

The same objection reinforced.

From what creature shall the first man's body which the fish devoured be challenged? or what creature shall the Almighty enjoin to make restitution of his entire matter? Shall the Almighty enjoin the fishes of the sea to cast up the morsels of man's flesh which they have eaten, as the whale did Jonas? But it is supposed that the bodily substance or matter of the man was converted into the substance or bodies of

the fishes which did eat him; for God did not preserve either the life or bodily matter of men devoured by fishes as he did preserve Jonas. Shall the man's body then be repaired out of the matter or bodily substance of the fishes which did eat him? But that, (as the atheists suppose, and is not in itself improbable,) other men have eaten, and turned it into the matter and substance of their bodies. And these men again have been eaten by other fishes, or by such land-monsters as the cannibals. Shall the first then or second men's bodies be repaired out of the bodily substance or matter of these later men which have eaten the fishes that eat the former, or out of the bodies of cannibals which have eaten them?

The question then remains, How the bodies of those men shall be repaired? or from what elements shall the relics or dissolved fragments of their bodies be recollected? seeing their bodies also have been either immediately devoured by cannibals, or mediately by other men, which have eaten the creatures that have devoured the former men? The cannibals, which devoured men, must by this article of Christian faith arise again with their own bodies, not with the bodies of other men, whom they have devoured; how then is it possible for every man to arise with his own body, seeing the bodies of many men—at least the relics or fragments into which they are dissolved—have been swallowed up by some one ravenous creature, and some one cannibal's human body may successively be the tomb or sepulchre of many men's bodies?

And here methinks that question which the Sadducees put unto our Saviour concerning the woman which had been married to seven brethren, one after another, might be more punctually proposed concerning the women of Samaria or Jerusalem, which in the

extremity of siege did make their hunger-starved stomachs the grave or sarcophagus of those tender infants whom they had lately conceived in their womb, and brought forth with joy.

The question by the Sadducees was thus proposed: 'Which of the seven brethren should have the woman to wife at the resurrection, seeing she had been wife successively to all the seven?'

The atheist or naturalist would propose his question thus: 'Whose shall the bodies of the infants (which their mothers devoured) at the day of the resurrection be? shall they belong as appurtenances to the bodies of their mothers, of which they were (though most unnaturally) made natural or material and substantial parts a little before these cruel mothers died? But then the infants should have no bodily substance, they could not arise with their own bodies. Or shall the relics of the bodies which their mothers swallowed be drawn or extracted (as a refiner doth gold out of dross, or silver out of baser metal) out of the ruins of their mothers' bodies? But so, their mothers should seem at the resurrection to want part of their bodily and much pined substances which they had at the separation of their souls and bodies: their bodies, by this supposition, cannot be the same they were when they died.'

5. This difficulty might by many like instances be both increased and enlarged; but the same answer which our Saviour gave unto the Sadducees, Matth. 448
xxii. 29, will sufficiently satisfy the atheist's objection, though not the atheist himself: He *therefore errs, because* he *knows not the scriptures, nor the power of God.* We may further add; In these collections he therefore errs, because he knows not the passive obediential power or capacity of nature, as subject and obedient to the active or all-working power of God.

The atheist's objection answered. It hath two loops.

How cunningly soever the aforesaid or the like knot may be cast by the naturalist, it hath two loops by which it may easily be loosed, by which it doth in a manner unloose or untie itself.

First, the atheist takes that as granted which he can never prove nor make probable out of the course of nature; to wit, that when one living creature devours another, as when fishes devour men, or men feed on fishes, or when one man eats another, the whole matter or bodily substance of the creature devoured should be converted into the matter or bodily substance of the eater or devourer. This never falls out in the whole course of nature. Of the most nourishing live creature that is, some part or fragment is not fit for nutriment; not the greediest fish that is can so entirely devour a man, but some part of his bodily substance will dissolve into the water, air, or some other element or mixed bodies; so will some part of the fishes or live creatures which men eat always dissolve into some other bodily substance besides the substance of the man which eats them. So that notwithstanding all the former supposed transmutations, or all that can be in like case supposed, some part of every man's body still remains; not converted into the substance of any other bodies, but into the air, earth, or water: and out of these relics and remainders every man's body may be raised again, and raised again the selfsame it was, but in a condition much advanced and improved for the better. As a great tree grows out of a small and slender root by the Creator's power, by that power which made the earth to bring forth trees most perfect in their kind in an instant; so the least fragment of man's body which remains either in the earth, in the water, or in other elements, may in a moment grow into an entire or

First loop.

perfect body. And this manner of the resurrection of one and the same body, not by an entire recollection or gathering together of all the material parts whereof the same body did sometimes consist, but by the improvement or multiplication of some one or few principal portions of the body which hath been, seems most agreeable to our apostle's inference in this place; of which hereafter.

The second loop of the atheist's objection.

6. Secondly, all the objections of the atheist or naturalist against this article are grounded upon another supposition taken by them as granted, which notwithstanding, in true philosophy, is apparently false. And their false ground or supposition is this, that unto the identity or unity of the same vegetable or sensitive body, (be it the body of a man, of a beast, or of a tree,) the unity or identity of the same material parts is necessarily required.

An ocular demonstration that the atheist's principles or supposals be false.

The grossness of this paradox, or false supposition, will appear from the very explication of the terms. The demonstration of its falsehood may be made ocular and palpable out of any vegetable or live body wherein the atheist or naturalist can make instance, but most apparently in the oak, which is the longest a dying of any tree; in the hart or raven, which are the longest lived amongst the beasts of the field or fowls of the air. An oak, albeit it stand four hundred years, or unto whatsoever height or greatness in that time it grows, is still the same tree or vegetable body which it was at the first plantation; yet the material parts of it cannot be altogether, or for the most part, the same that they were. The whole matter or bodily substance of it, when it was first set, was not the thousandth part 449
of that bodily substance which after three hundred years' growth it hath; and of the matter which it had when it was but a yard high, it is not imaginable that

any one part, so much as a pin's head, should be remaining the same it was after it come to be twenty yards in height and a yard in thickness. It could not grow in height or breadth unless some parts of the matter which it first had did daily exhale or evaporate, and new matter come into their places.

Augmentation and growth in vegetables necessarily supposeth nutrition; and nutrition includes a daily decay of nutriment gotten, or of the matter whereof the body consists, and a new supply or reparation of the matter or substance lost or wasted by preparation of some new nutriment.

A raven likewise is the selfsame fowl when it is ready to die for age that it was when it was first hatched; but the matter of it cannot possibly be the selfsame; it is not conceivable that so much as an inch of the same matter which it had when it was first hatched should continue in it the same till death; for its natural heat doth perpetually consume or waste some part of its matter or substance; and its blood, without perpetual nourishment by new food or matter prepared, would be dried up by its natural heat; for life consists in *calido et humido*, in heat and moisture, and cannot be continued in any live creature without continual nutriment, more than the fire or flame can be preserved without fuel. Nor could the life, or natural heat, wherein life specially consists, stand in such perpetual need of nutrition or new matter whereon to feed, unless there were a continual dissolution of some material parts, which vanish or expire out of the body, though not so visibly, yet as certainly, as fume or smoke doth out of the fuel wherewith the fire or flame is fed. Unless there were some precedent diminution or wasting of the material parts in man's body, there could be no proper growth or

augmentation of the whole body, or of every part; for if every least particle did remain the same it was, as well for quantity as for quality, the whole body could not be augmented in every part, but it must be as great again as it was before after every such growth or augmentation. For there can be no augmentation or growth in any part otherwise than by addition of some sensible nutriment: now if every least part be augmented by addition of some new or sensible matter or substance, the addition which is made unto every least part would be as great as the part to which it is added: for it is supposed that every least part is augmented, and augmented it cannot be but by addition of some other sensible body, which cannot be less than the least part sensible of a body, or of a sensible body.

7. But if we grant, as the truth is, that the material parts of the body augmented remain not the self-same to-day which they were yesterday or a week ago, but are still fluent and wasting, other material parts coming into their place with some addition of quantity, so as the addition in bodies growing by daily nutriment be still greater than the waste or diminution, the manner of natural growth or augmentation may be easily conceived. And it was a truth of nature excellently expressed by the great philosopher; *Aucto toto augetur quælibet pars etiam minutissima:* "Whensoever the whole body is augmented, every least part is augmented." As if the whole body in the space of a year be augmented by the quantity of a palm or a span, the thousandth part of the body must be augmented by the thousandth part of a palm or span. But thus the whole body (as the same philosopher observes) is in every part augmented *non quoad formam, sed quoad materiam.* And his reason is, *quia materia est in perpetuo fluxu,* because the material

parts of man's body are perpetually fluent, always de-
450 caying and always repaired. It is a maxim again of the same philosopher, that *auctum manet idem numero*, that every vegetable body being augmented (how long soever the growth or augmentation lasts) is numerically the same it was.

The case then is clear out of the book of nature, (by which the atheist or infidel will only be tried,) that the body or bodily life of man, how long soever he live, remains one and the same from his birth unto his death, albeit the matter of which his body is composed, and wherein his life is seated, do not remain the same. As the face or image of the sun remains the same in a water or river, albeit the parts of the water in which it is imprinted do not continue the same, but as one portion of water slideth away another comes in its place, altogether as apt to take the impression or picture of the sun as the former; or as the light continues one and the same in a lamp, albeit the oil, which preserves its light, do continually waste; for one drop or portion of the same oil, or of new oil poured in, is as apt to continue the light as the former drops were which are wasted. The light then remains the selfsame, albeit the oil continually waste; so that unto numerical identity of the same light, the numerical unity or identity, or the same portion, of oil is not required, cannot possibly be had. It sufficeth that the oil or matter which feeds the lamp be the same by equivalency. By these and many like unquestionable instances in nature, the atheist's or infidel's supposition is altogether false; to wit, That unto the resurrection of the same body, or unto the restauration of the same bodily life, the identity of matter, or of material parts, which it formerly had, is necessarily required. I add, that this identity or unity of matter is less

needful unto the numerical unity or identity of man's body, because the soul of man, amongst all other vegetables, is only immortal, and remaineth the same it was after it be severed from the body.

8. Taking then the first supposition of the atheist as true; suppose the bodily matter of some men to have been altogether or entirely transubstantiated, or changed into the bodily substance of some other men, and that two or three of such men might have the whole bodily substance of some other man or child in their bodies when they died, it is no probable argument or forcible objection to say, This man or child, whose bodily substance is supposed to be converted into the substance of other men, cannot arise again with the same body which he had, because he cannot have the same matter which he had, unless the other lose some part of the matter which they had in them when they died. Suppose the material parts of every man were utterly annihilated when they died, yet their bodies may be made the selfsame again which they were, not only by creation of new matter out of nothing, but out of any matter or elements preexistent, so prepared and proportioned to their individual nature or bodily life as the former was. For the numerical unity or individual entity of every nature consists in the unity or proportioned correspondency to that model whereto the Almighty Creator did frame it.

To conclude then: seeing the resurrection of the same bodies wherein we die must be wrought by the power of God, it is fitting that we refer the particular manner, how our bodies shall be entirely restored, unto God himself. We will not dispute whether the resurrection of every man in his own body shall be wrought, *de facto*, by recollecting of the dust into which men

are turned; or of the same material parts which every man had when he died; or whether it shall be wrought by creation of some new matter, or only by preparing some other elementary matter preexistent, and working it into the same individual temper or constitution
451 into which our bodily food or nutriment was wrought whilst we lived. It sufficeth to have shewed, that every man may arise with his own body by any of the former ways; or partly by one, partly by another.

Lastly, the recollection of the same material fragments or relics into which our bodies are dissolved, is no more necessary, by the principles of nature or true philosophy, unto the constitution of the same bodies (at the day of the resurrection) which before have been, than the recollection or regress of the same matter or nutriment, whereof our blood or flesh was made, or by which our life was preserved in childhood, is unto the continuance or constitution of the same life, flesh, or blood in old age. The life of every man in old age is the same, the body the same, the flesh the same, the blood the same, which it was in childhood; albeit the blood or greatest part of our bodies in childhood was made of one kind of nutriment, and the blood which we have in mature or old age be made of another, much different nutriment. Yea, albeit we alter our food or diet every year, yet our bodies remain still the same, every finger the same, whilst it continues in the body, and whilst this bodily life continues. For albeit the nutriment be of divers kinds, yet nature, or the digestive faculty, works all into one temper; and this temper continues the same in divers portions of the matter which is continually fluent, and the same only by equivalency.

Now if nature, by God's appointment and cooperation, can work divers kinds of food or nutriment into

the same form or constitution, it will be no improbable supposal to say, that the God of nature can work any part of the element of water, of air, or of earth, any fragment or relic of Adam's body, into the same individual form or mould wherein the bodily life of the man that shall be last dead before Christ's coming to judgment did consist. Yet will it be no hard thing for God to make Adam the selfsame body wherein he died out of the relics of this man's body.

To work this mutual exchange between the material parts of several men's bodies without any hinderance or impeachment to the numerical identity of any man's body, or without any prejudice to this truth, that every man shall arise with his own body, which we Christians believe is impossible to nature, or to any natural causes, they can be no agents in this work; yet it is no ways impossible (for it implieth no contradiction) for nature thus to be wrought and fashioned by the Creator and Preserver of mankind. In avouching thus much, we say no more than some (I take it) mere philosophers have delivered in other terms: *Quicquid potest prima causa per secundam, idem potest per se sola:* "Whatsoever the First Cause doth by the instrumental agency or service of second causes, the same he may do by his sole power, without the service of any instrumental or second cause." Now God, by the heart, by the liver, and by the digestive faculty, as by causes instrumental or secondary, doth change the substance of herbs, of fruits, of fish, of roots into the very substance of man's body, without dissolving the unity of his bodily life; and therefore, if it please him, may change the material parts of one man into another man's body or substance without the help or instrumental service of the nutritive or digestive faculty, or any other instrumental cause; all this

he may do immediately by his sole power; but whether it be his will so to do or no at the last day, be it ever reserved, with all reverence and submission, to his infinite wisdom alone.

The scruple incident into an ingenuous mind.

9. One scruple more there is, wherewith ingenuous minds, and well-affected, may be sometimes touched. The doubt may be framed thus: 'Although it be most true and evident from the book of nature, that the natural or digestive faculty of man doth preserve the
452 unity of bodily life entire by diversity of matter or nutriment, yet the living body so preserved is one and the same by continuation of existence or duration. His days, whilst natural life continues, are not cut off by death, he doth not for a moment cease to be what he was; but when we speak of resurrection from death, when we say the dead shall arise with their own bodies, here is a manifest interruption of bodily life, or of man's duration in bodily life: his body ceaseth to be a living body as it was; and therefore, if he must live again in the body, the body to which his soul shall be united at his resurrection may be called his own body, because it shall be inhabited or possessed with his immortal soul; but how shall it be the same body which he formerly had, seeing the existence or duration of him, or of his soul in the body, is divided by death, and division destroyeth unity? This leaf or paper is one, yet if we divide it in the middle, it is no more one, but two papers.'

The question then comes to this short and perspicuous issue, Whether the uninterrupted continuance of duration or existence, or unity of time, wherewith the duration of man's life is measured, be as necessary to the unity or identity of his bodily nature or being, as unity or continuation of quantity is unto the unity of bodies divisible or quantitative. The determination

or judgment is easy; the book of nature being judge, it is evident that unity of time, or continuation of man's life, without interruption, is but accidental to the unity of bodily nature or being. It is a circumstance only, no such part of the essence or nature, as continuation or unity of quantity is of the unity of bodies divisible; for time and quantity are by nature divisible, whereas the nature of man, or other things that exist in time, is indivisible. It is true, division makes a plurality in things that are by nature divisible, but not in natures indivisible. Every thing that is divisible, though it be *unum actu*, yet it is *plura in potentia*. In that it may be divided, it is not purely, simply, or altogether one, but may be made two or more: and whilst it remains one, it is one by conjunction of parts. The entire substance of any natural body, as it is divisible or subject to dimension, cannot be contained under one part of quantity, but part of it is contained under one part of quantity, part of it under another; for *omne quantum habet partem extra partem*, and in that regard is divisible. The whole substance divisible cannot subsist, but in the whole quantity or measure.

The higher and lower parts of a tree or pillar have no unity betwixt themselves, but as both are united to the middle parts. If it be divided in the middle, the union and unity is lost; after the division made, it is not one, but two; one division makes it two, two divisions make it three. But in bodies sensible or vegetable, considered as parts of the nature or essence of such bodies, the case is quite otherwise. A man is the same man, the selfsame bodily substance or vegetable, this year, which he was three years ago: and his bodily substance this year is not therefore one and the same with the bodily substance which he had three

years ago, because it is one with the bodily substance which he had the last year, but entirely one and the same in all: we cannot say that part of his bodily nature was existent in the first year, part in the second year, and part in the third year; for his whole bodily nature was entirely in the first year, and in every part and hour of the first year: the same bodily nature was entirely in every hour of the second year, and so in every hour of the third year. For though man's body be divisible in quantity, though his duration be likewise divisible, yet his bodily nature is indivisible, and entirely the same in every moment of its own duration. And for this reason, although death may make a divi-
453 sion or interruption in its duration or existence, yet it makes no plurality or division in its nature: in what part of time soever his nature gets new existence, it is entirely and indivisibly the same it was.

10. The former instance, drawn from the divisibility of a body subject to quantity or dimension, would hold much better thus: As one part of such a body being separated from the rest (suppose a branch or slip of a tree being united to another tree by inoculation or ingrafting) remains the selfsame substance it was, though it now exist not in the same tree but in another; so the bodily substance of man, though cut off by death from the company of the living, and severed from all coexistence with the things which now are, may be the selfsame substance which it sometimes was, although it get no coexistence with the things which now are, but with the substances which shall be many hundred years hence; it may be at that time the same which formerly it was, as truly and properly as if it had continued its coexistence or actual being with the things which now are, or actually shall be, till it be again. As a slip or

branch taken from a tree in France, and ingrafted in a tree in England, is as truly and properly the same branch it was, as if it had continued still united to the same tree wherein it did first grow. In this latter case, there is only a separation of place, a plurality only of unitions or coexistences of the same branch with divers trees, no plurality of branches.

Suppose God had cut off Adam's days on earth at the instant wherein he did eat the forbidden fruit, and deferred his replantation in the land of the living again until these times wherein we live; here had been a separation of him from those times wherein he lived many hundred of years; here had been a plurality of times wherein he lived, a plurality of his coexistences with divers times, and with divers men, no plurality of human natures in Adam: his nature might have been one and the same as truly, and as indivisibly one and the same in these times, distant one from the other by the space of five thousand years, as if he had lived from his first creation till the sounding of the last trump unto judgment. And thus much of the exceptions or cavils made by atheists or infidels against this article of the resurrection; in which we Christians believe, that every man shall arise with his own body, the same bodily substance which he had or was whilst he lived here on earth.

11. And now for application, or conclusion. Let us here suppose that the atheist, as he makes himself worse than a beast whilst he lives on earth, could hope to make himself equal to beasts in his death, or to be transformed into a swine. Imagine he should endeavour to drown his immortal soul in a tavern, or to bury his bodily natural essence in the stews; suppose his body might by Venus' fire, or other loathsome fruits of filthy lust, be dissolved into ashes, and the

ashes of it be dispersed through all the winds; imagine his bones might in some filthy puddle be resolved into slime, and become the food or nutriment of crawling toads, or of other more venomous creatures; the pursuit of these his fearful desperate hopes could nothing avail him, they would be at best but as pledges of greater shame and misery to befall him; the powerful hand of his Almighty Judge will raise him up at the last day, with the same body which he had exposed to all this shame and misery; with the selfsame body for nature and substance, but not the same for quality or durability; for it shall after death be ten thousand times more capable of pain than in this life it was of pleasure. All his bodily pleasures came to an end before he came to an end of his bodily life: these always die before he dies that hath wedded himself unto them. But his pain shall never die, his pains,
454 though deadly, shall never come to an end. These are the endless fruits of that man's short days on earth, which wholly mispends his time in foolish bodily pleasures or noisome lusts. But for the souls of the righteous, (whatsoever become of their bodies after death,) they are still in the hands of God, they are wholly at his disposal, whether those bodies wherein they dwelt do fall by the enemy's sword, or come unto their graves in peace, whether they become a prey unto the beasts of the field, to the fowls of the air, or to the fishes of the sea. And let us, whilst we live, establish our souls with this doctrine of our apostle; and also lay that saying of Tertullian (recited before, chap. 13. num. 9.) unto our hearts: *Considera teipsum, O homo, et fidem rei invenies; recogita quid fueris, antequam esses, utique nihil:* "Consider thyself, O man, and thou shalt find the undoubted truth of what we teach; recall to mind, if thou canst, what thou

wast before thou wast, and thou shalt find that thou wert nothing." *Qui non eras, factus es; cum iterum non eris, fies.* "There was a time when thou wast not, and yet there was a time wherein thou wast made; and albeit the times be now coming wherein thou shalt not be, yet shalt thou be made again." All times are alike to God; his power to make thee again cannot be restrained by thy weakness or not being; it cannot be shortened by any length of time; all of us that now are, all the generations that hereafter shall be, *must appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that all may receive in the body, according to the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad. For he shall recompense every man according to all his works;* yea so recompense, that both those which now deny it, and those that now believe and confess it, shall from experience then say, *Verily there is a reward for the righteous; doubtless there is a God that judgeth the earth.*

CHAP. XVI.

1 CORINTH. XV. 16, 17, 20.

For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins, &c. *But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept.*

The Apostle's Method in proving the Resurrection peculiar, and yet artificial. His Way of mutual or reciprocal Inference, both negative and assertive, justified, and shewed that both these Inferences naturally arise, and may concludently be gathered from the Text, and from the Principles of Christian Belief. Wherein the Witness (false upon Supposition, verses 14, 15.) *should consist. That philosophical Principle,* Deus et natura nihil faciunt frustra, *divinely improved. God's special and admirable Works have ever a Correspondent, that is, some extraordinary rare End.*

How Sin is taken away by Christ's Death, how by his Resurrection. How we are justified by Christ's Resurrection. How we may try ourselves, and know whether we rightly believe this Article of the Resurrection of the Dead, or no.

1. THAT the resurrection from death to life is in nature possible, (as implying no contradiction,) though
455 unto nature or any natural agent most impossible, hath been discussed at large before. That there shall, *de facto*, be a resurrection unto glory, merely depends upon the will and pleasure, or powerful ordinance of God; who, as we believe, is able to effect whatsoever his will or pleasure is should be wrought. And our belief of this resurrection unto glory must be grounded upon his will and pleasure revealed in scriptures.

How God's will and pleasure to raise up the dead in Christ to an endless immortal and most happy life hath been clearly revealed by his prophets in the Old Testament, I have shewed otherwhere; and any one of ordinary observation, in reading the scriptures and commentators, may collect. Especially, taking example and light from our blessed Saviour's managing that text, Exod. iii. 6, *I am the God of Abraham*, &c., in his argument with the Sadducees, who both denied the resurrection and disputed (as they thought subtilly and irrefragably) against it, and observing the great dexterity of St. Peter in the second, and of St. Paul in the thirteenth of the Acts, in proving the resurrection of Christ out of the Psalms, and out of the prophet Isaiah; and how fitly St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 54, 55, makes application of the prophecy of Hosea, chap. xiii. 14, unto the proper matter and season wherein it shall *consummativè* be fulfilled.

I shall here make such observations as naturally arise from the verses before recited, and from other

verses in that chapter, wherein the apostle useth such a method or manner of argument, to prove the resurrection from the dead, as neither Moses nor any prophet had used before. They indeed foretold and foresignified respectively, that Christ should die and rise again, and that all which believe in him should be raised to a life immortal with him. But the connexion betwixt these two assertions, (which we are bound severally to believe from the authority of Moses and the prophets,) as, that Christ's resurrection from the grave should be the necessary cause of our resurrection; or, that our future resurrection should necessarily infer Christ's resurrection from the dead; or, that the denial or doubt of our resurrection should infer a denial or doubt of his resurrection, is more than can easily be gathered out of Moses or the prophets.

This mutual inference of the one's resurrection by the other, whether negatively or assertively, was first made by our apostle in this place, at least in express terms, though implicitly made by our Saviour before.

Our apostle, in making this mutual inference, seems, in the judgment of some[n], to transgress or violate the laws of argumentation generally agreed upon in the school of nature, which, notwithstanding, he elsewhere and usually more exquisitely observes than any naturalist doth.

The inferences made by our apostle are radically and generally two: the one negative, *per reductionem ad impossibile, aut absurdum:* the other affirmative, by positive proof.

The negative hath many branches:

The first is, ver. 13, *If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen.*

[n] Vide Glossam et Hugonem in hunc locum.

The second springs out of this, in ver. 14, *And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain.* And yet of this their faith one branch was their belief in Christ's death and passion.

The third branch seems to spring out of both these, ver. 15, *Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ: whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not.*

The first branch is resumed again by our apostle in ver. 16, and the second likewise in ver. 17, with this
456 addition, that *if Christ be not raised, then such as believe in Christ are yet in their sins.* And, ver. 18, *then they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished;* not only frustrated of their hopes of the life to come, but deprived or cozened of such pleasures or contentments of this life as the unbelievers enjoy, and without loss or detriment might enjoy, if the dead were not to be raised up, or if Christ were not already raised from the dead: for he saith, ver. 19, *If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.*

The affirmative inference is contained in verses 12. (and 20.) *Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?* This interrogation, resolved into an affirmative, imports thus much: 'If we truly preach, and you truly believe, that Christ was raised from the dead, then we must of necessity preach, and you of necessity believe, that there shall be a general resurrection of the dead, and that such as die in Christ shall be raised up to immortal glory.' And this affirmative is expressly assumed by our apostle, ver. 20: *But now is Christ risen from the*

dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept. And afterward by him powerfully reinforced, as may be seen in verses 21, 22, 23.

How St. Paul's inferences may be collected.

That this is our apostle's intent and meaning there can be no question; all the difficulty is, how either the negative inferences or inconveniences which he presseth upon such as deny the resurrection of the dead, or the affirmative points which he chargeth these Corinthians, and in them us, undoubtedly to believe, can be concludently gathered from the principles of our belief.

2. To begin with the negative inferences, and in particular with the third branch, ver. 15: *Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God*, &c. Let us examine wherein did, wherein could, the falsehood of this testimony consist.

Some perhaps would reply, that we are not to say any thing of God (though not unbefitting his majesty) but that which is most true. We are not indeed, so far as we know and believe: but albeit we fail in that we speak of him, yet this is not enough to convince us of bearing false testimony of him. To say or speak that of any which we take to be the truth, and to say it, not with purpose to calumniate or slander, but rather to his praise or commendations, is not to bear false testimony of him, much less against him, albeit we be out of charity mistaken in that which we say of him. Admit then that the apostle had been in some error concerning the resurrection, when he first taught the Romans and these Corinthians, that as Christ was raised from the dead to life immortal, so we also in good time shall be raised to the same or like immortal life; and that as he, so we also, should be raised by the immediate power of God; his supposed mistake in the latter could not convince him of bearing false testimony

on God's behalf, seeing that which he saith concerning the resurrection of others (besides Christ) from the dead, doth tend to God's glory. For to bear false testimony of or against any, doth always include some matter of imputation, of aspersion, or prejudice, whether we bear such testimony of God or of man.

What imputation or prejudice was it then to affirm, that God had raised up Christ from the dead, if there were no general resurrection of others from the dead? or wherein doth the falsehood of the testimony, which our apostle seeks to avert from himself, punctually consist? Did it consist in saying, that he raised up Christ, whom he did not raise up, if so be the dead rise not? The apostle doth not suppose it as question-
457 able, (much less simply deny it,) that God did raise up Christ from the dead, but only deduceth his adversary to this inconvenience or absurdity, that if the dead were not raised up, then Christ was not raised, and that he had borne false witness of God in saying that he had raised up Christ. So that the ground of the false testimony lies in the denying of others' resurrection from the dead. Yea, to avouch that God did raise up Christ from the dead, (although the fact were true and unquestionable that God did raise him up,) were in our apostle's divinity to lay an imputation or slander on God, if so be that such as believe in Christ, and die in Christ, should not be raised up unto bliss and glory, better it were, (or at least less evil,) in our apostle's judgment, to deny that Christ was risen from the dead, than granting this, to deny the resurrection of such as sleep in Christ. For to grant the former and to deny the latter, were to cast an imputation of folly upon God, and an aspersion of imposture upon the Son of God Christ Jesus our Lord. What imputation

then is it unto God, or how doth this aspersion rise and fall upon Christ or his apostle, by granting that Christ was indeed raised up, and yet denying that the dead shall be raised up again?

3. It is a maxim in philosophy, generally acknowledged if not first conceived by the heathens, *Deus et natura nihil frustra faciunt*, "God and nature work nothing in vain." From this principle, such of the heathens as knew not God, such as denied his providence, or knew not how to distinguish him or it from nature, held it an impiety or profaneness to slander nature, either of error in her working, or of folly in producing effects to no good end or purpose. Some there were which did question, whether monsters (as children which are born with two heads, with more toes or fingers than are usual, &c.) were not *errata naturæ*, errors, imperfections, or oversights of nature. But they finally resolve, that albeit such events might fall out by the error, or contrary to the intentions or endeavours of that particular nature wherein these misfigurations were found, yet they were intended by a more general nature, and intended by it to some good use and purpose; as commonly prodigious births do portend somewhat whose knowledge is useful and good for others. Now the heathens erred in ascribing that to general or universal nature, which was peculiar unto God, who is the author, moderator, and guide of nature, whether general or particular.

A philosophical maxim advanced and much improved.

And if by general or universal nature they meant no other thing than we do by the Guide and God of nature, *mentem teneant, linguam corrigant*, their meaning was good, but their expression of it much amiss. This we know, that God doth suffer or cause nature ofttimes to miscarry in her course or projects,

for ends best known to himself. No man is born blind, or deaf, or dumb, without some error or defect in that particular nature whereof or by which his body is framed. All these and the like effects are besides the intention or contrary to the endeavour of nature, which always aims at the best. Hence our Saviour's disciples, as we read John ix. 2, when they saw a man which was blind from his birth, asked of their Master, *Who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?* They had not moved this question, unless by light of nature they had known that blindness from his birth was contrary to the ordinary and common course of nature, though not contrary but consonant to the will of God in this particular. For it is more than probable that they had read, though then perhaps they did not actually remember, *who made the dumb, or the deaf, him that seeeth, or the blind? have not I the Lord?* Exod.
458 iv. 11. God, they likewise knew, did for some good end or just cause, either suffer or cause nature to miscarry in this man; and they likewise knew sin to be a just cause of many miscarriages in the human nature. And hence they question, whether God had punished this man with blindness from the birth for his own or for his parents' sins.

But they themselves did err in collecting, that extraordinary blindness had befallen him, either for some extraordinary sins of his own or of his parents, and this error our Saviour rectifies, John ix. 3: *Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents;* that is, neither of them were more extraordinary sinners than others were, who neither were blind themselves, nor had children that were blind from the birth. The true cause of this defect in nature's work in framing this man, the true reason why he was born blind, (as our Saviour ex-

presseth in the next words,) was, *that the works of God should be made manifest in him.* So true it is, which the heathens had observed, *Deus et natura nihil frustra faciunt.* It was not in vain, nor to no purpose, that nature did not effect or accomplish her work in this poor man; for by this means God's works in him were more manifest to himself and others, than if he had been born with eagle's eyes. He was not only cured miraculously of his native blindness, but the eyes of his understanding by this miraculous cure were opened and enlightened to see more for his soul's health, than the learned scribes and Pharisees did, in whom neither nature nor art had been defective.

4. Galen, that great physician and curious searcher into all the secrets of the human nature, had well observed, "that there is no part nor parcel in the whole body of man, which hath not its proper use." And from contemplation of this undoubted truth, he was enforced to acknowledge what otherwise he seemed to deny, *divinum opificem*, "a divine artificer" or worker even of the least and most contemptible parts of man's natural body. And of this work of God, though much defaced by our first parents' sin, he gave the like verdict that God himself did of all his works, "that every part of man's body was good, exceeding good, and admirably framed to its proper use or function." The most artificial works of man, of the most exquisite and most industrious artificer, will always admit some errors and defects; no work of man is good in its kind; that is the best which hath the fewest faults or oversights, or is adorned with the fewest impertinent or unuseful beautifications; whereas the works of nature, even the defects of particular nature, are useful and profitable for the setting forth of God's glory, and

for procurement or advancement of the public good. Now if the ordinary works of nature (which be likewise the works of God) be never vain, idle, or impertinent, but have a correspondent use or end, to which without error they serve; much more must the extraordinary works of God be presupposed to have some special end or extraordinary use as proportionable to them, as the end or use of ordinary works of nature are to the ordinary operations or endeavours of nature. Now our apostle supposeth, that our Saviour's resurrection from the dead was an extraordinary work of God; the most remarkable work of God that had been manifested to the world; and by necessary consequence, it must have an effect or end most remarkably correspondent unto it; and what was that? the resurrection of such as live and die in Christ; or rather the manifestation of God's glory and unspeakable goodness in their resurrection unto immortal glory and happiness.

5. The former principle, *Deus nihil frustra facit,* being thus far improved, (that all God's special and admirable works tend to some special and admirable use and purpose,) both parts of our apostle's mutual inference—as well the negative, *If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised,* as the affirmative, *If Christ be raised, then shall the dead arise*—will appear to be as firm and sound, as the mutual inference of the cause from the effect, and of the effect from the cause; or as firm and sound as the mutual inference of the final cause by the efficient, and of the efficient by the final. Albeit, to speak properly, and in the exact terms of the schools, the necessity of the efficient cause depends upon the necessity of the end—the end makes the efficient to be necessary—the efficient doth not make the end to be necessary. The immediate proper

effect of the efficient is not the end or final cause itself, but *medium proxime destinatum ad finem*, some mean immediately destinated to the end; without which the end or scope, at which nature in her operations aimed, cannot be obtained.

If one should ask why man and other terrestrial creatures have lungs, whenas fishes (as most men, and more probably, think) have none; the reason were good, and the answer satisfactory to say, That man and other like creatures stand in need of respiration, and so of lungs to temper or cool their blood, with whose excessive heat or distemper life otherwise would quickly be choked. The preservation then of life is the end or final cause why man and other like creatures have lungs. But why life should be preserved, no cause can be given in nature; this is a principle presupposed. Howbeit, of respiration or breathing, without which the life of man cannot be preserved or continued, the lungs are the true and proper efficient cause.

This mutual inference is good, *Quicquid pulmones habet, respirat; quicquid respirat, pulmones habet:* Whatsoever creature hath lungs, hath also the benefit of breath or respiration;—this is an argument from the cause: and, Whatsoever hath the benefit of breathing or respiration, hath lungs;—this is an argument from the effect: and again, negatively, Whatsoever hath no lungs, hath no benefit of breath or respiration; Whatsoever hath not the benefit of respiration, hath no lungs.

In St. Paul's divinity, the manifestation of God's glory and goodness in the redemption of man, is the end or final cause of all the articles which we believe concerning Christ as God and man; of which, even for this reason, we are to seek no further cause or

reason. But the manifestation of this his goodness being presupposed as made necessary by his omnipotent will, the mutual inference between the Son of God's incarnation, or between the several parts of his sacerdotal or regal function, and the several parts of our redemption, will be as perspicuous and firm, as any inference included in the former or like instances.

First, unless God's will and pleasure had been set to manifest his goodness in the redemption of mankind, the Son of God had not been incarnate—had not died—had not been raised from the dead. The manifestation of God's glory in our redemption was the true cause why the Son of God was to be incarnate: his incarnation was not the cause why God's goodness was to be manifested, or why his will and pleasure was set to redeem us. For this (as we said) is the final cause, and can have no other cause of its necessity, but rather imposeth a necessity upon other causes subordinate, as upon Christ's incarnation, passion, and resurrection. But however Christ's incarnation was not the cause why God's glory and goodness was to be manifested in our redemption, yet the actual manifestation of God's goodness in our redemption, and our redemption itself, is procured by the incarnation and sacerdotal function of Christ, as by a true and proper efficient cause.

460 And we may safely infer, first, that unless the Son of God had been incarnate, God's goodness to us had not been so admirably manifested.

Secondly, unless the Son of God had become man, man could not have been delivered from the fetters and chains of sin, much less restored to his first dignity.

And yet more; in that the Son of God became man, this is an argument evident to us from the effect, that man by sin had become the son of Satan: sin then was

the cause of Christ's incarnation, and Christ's incarnation is the cause or means of our deliverance or redemption from sin.

Again, unless man by sin had become the servant of sin and bondman of Satan, the Son of God had not taken upon him the form of a servant. But inasmuch as the Son of God was found in the true form of a servant, this is an argument from the effect, evident to convince our consciences that we sons of men were by nature the servants or bondmen of Satan.

Lastly, unless the wages of sin, and of our service done to Satan by working the works of sin, had been death, the true and natural Son of God had not been put to death. Our sins then, and the wages due to our sins, (that was death,) were the causes of his death. And in that he truly died for us, this is an argument evident from the effect, therefore, we were dead in our sins.

Be it so; yet seeing the Son of God died for our sins before he was raised from the dead, how saith our apostle, ver. 17, *If Christ be not raised, ye are yet in your sins?* Could these Corinthians or any others be still in their sins after their sins were taken away? Or will any man deny that their sins were taken away by Christ's death at the very instant of his soul's departure from the body, or when he said, *Consummatum est—It is finished?* What was finished? The work which he undertook, and that was the taking away of our sins, or the work of our redemption. Now if this work were finished when our Saviour Christ said, *It is finished*, these Corinthians' sins were taken away before Christ's resurrection. And if sin by Christ's death had been actually and utterly taken away, our apostle's inference in this place had been unsound, none had remained in their sins, albeit Christ

had not risen again. Sin then, even the sins of the world, were taken away by Christ's death, but not actually and utterly taken away. If sin had been so taken away by Christ's death, there had been no such necessity of Christ's resurrection from the dead, as our apostle here presseth upon the Corinthians, not as matter of opinion, but as a fundamental principle of faith. It remains then to be declared, in what sense, or how far, sin was taken away by Christ's death; in what sense it hath been, or how far it shall be, taken away by his resurrection.

7. First then, Christ's death was a ransom all-sufficient for the sins of the world, the full price of redemption for all mankind throughout the world, from the beginning to the end of it[o]. But did not many who died before Christ die in their sins? They did; yet he was promised to our first parents, to the end, that even these might not die in their sins. How these come to forfeit their interest in the promise made to Adam, and to all that came after him, that we leave to the wisdom of God. Of this we are sure, that the Wisdom and Son of God did die for all men then living, and for all that were to live after unto the world's end. And inasmuch as he died for all, he is said to take away the sins of all; that is, he paid the full ransom for the sins of all, and purchased a general
461 pardon at his Father's hands; and he himself by dying became an universal inexhaustible sovereign medicine for all sins that were then extant in the world, or should be extant in man until the world's end.

Christ's death said to take away sin in a twofold sense. The first.

So then by his death he took away the sins of the world in a twofold sense.

First, In that he paid the full ransom for the sins of all men. Whatsoever sins were past could be no

[o] See chap. 4. §. 12. [vol. x. p. 65.]

prejudice to any, so they would embrace God's pardon, sealed by Christ's death, and proclaimed by his apostles and disciples after his death. In this sense we may say, the king's general pardon takes away all offences and misdemeanours against his crown and dignity, albeit many afterwards suffer for such misdemeanours, only because they do not sue out their pardons, or crave allowance of them.

The second sense.

Christ is said again to take away the sins of the world by his death, inasmuch as by his death he became the universal and sovereign medicine for all men's sins. But many died in Israel, not because there was no balm in Gilead, as many do amongst us, not so much for want of good physic or sovereign medicines, as for want of will to seek for them in due time; or for wilfulness in not using medicines proffered unto them. So then it will not follow, that no man dies in his sin since Christ's death, albeit we grant that the sins of all were taken away by his death: for they were not so taken away, as that men might not resume or take them again; and the greatest condemnation which shall befall the world will be, that when God had taken away their sins, they would not part with their sins; that when God would have healed them, they would not be healed.

The benefits punctually arising from Christ's death, and from his resurrection.

But had these Corinthians been any further from having their sins taken away by Christ's death, if Christ had truly died for them, and yet but only died for them, and not risen again?

Yes; though Christ had died for all, yet all had died in their sins, if he had only died, and had not been raised again. This inference is expressly avouched by our apostle in the 17th and 18th verses: *If Christ be not raised, then they also which are fallen asleep in*

Christ are perished; and yet he supposeth that they believed in Christ's death.

But though the inference be most true, because avouched by our apostle, yet is it not universally, but indefinitely true: how far, and in respect of what sins, or in what degree of perishing, it is true, that is the question.

8. *Christ was delivered,* saith the apostle, (his meaning is, he was delivered unto death,) *for our sins, and was raised again for our justification,* Rom. iv. 25. Are we then otherwise justified by his resurrection than we are by his death? So our apostle's words import: and if otherwise justified by his resurrection than by his death, then are our sins otherwise taken away by virtue of his resurrection, than by virtue of his death they were taken away. What shall we say then? that Christ's death did not merit all the benefits which God had to bestow upon us? God forbid! All this notwithstanding, we do not receive all the benefits which God for his death's sake bestows upon us, by believing only in his death; but even this benefit of our justification we receive more immediately by our belief of his resurrection from the dead.

This is the doctrine of our apostle even in that place, wherein he handles the doctrine of justification by faith alone, or by the imputation of Christ's righteousness, *ex professo;* as Rom. iv. 23, 24: *Now it*
462 *was not written for his sake* (to wit, Abraham's) *alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead.* And he gives the reason why our belief of this article should be imputed unto us, (in the next words,) seeing *he was delivered* to death *for our offences, and was raised*

again for our justification. Howbeit even this belief of his resurrection is a grace or blessing of God, which Christ did merit by his death; yet a grace conveyed unto us by the virtue of his resurrection, or by Christ himself, by his resurrection, exalted unto glory in his human nature.

We were justified by his death, inasmuch as the pardon for our sins was by it purchased, and the handwriting or obligation against us cancelled. If Christ then had only died for us, and not risen again, we might by belief in his death have escaped the second death, or everlasting pains of hell. We should notwithstanding, as our apostle here supposeth, have been detained perpetual prisoners in the grave; our bodily or corporal being should have been utterly consumed by the first death, without hope of recovery or restitution. And so far as the first death had dominion over men, so far had these Corinthians remained in their sins. So long as the first death remains unconquered, sin remains. Now if Christ had not been raised from the dead, the first death, or death of the body, had remained unconquered. Belief in Christ's death could not utterly have freed them from all the wages of sin; for death of the body is in us part of the wages of sin; and it was to Christ part of the burden of our sin. But inasmuch as Christ is risen from the dead, and raised to an immortal life, over which bodily death hath no rule or dominion, but must be put in absolute subjection to him; all that truly believe such a resurrection are justified, not only from the eternal guilt of sin, not only freed from everlasting death, but are made heirs by adoption unto a life over which death shall have no power. So then by Christ's death we are freed from the everlasting curse; by his resurrection we are made free denizens

Had Christ only died, and not risen again, though we had not come in hell, yet we had never come out of the grave.

of the heavenly Jerusalem, heirs by promise of an everlasting and most blessed life. And thus far all that are partakers of the word and sacraments are said to be justified by his resurrection; that is, they are bound to believe, that as he died for their sins, to redeem them from the second death, so he rose again for their further justification, to free them from the death of the body: he therefore rose from the dead, that we, by believing this article, might receive the adoption of the sons of God.

But yet there is a further degree of justification, that is, an actual absolution from the reign or dominion of sin in our bodies, which is never obtained without some measure of faith or sanctifying grace inherent; albeit the true use and end of such grace and faith inherent be to sue out the pardon for our sins in particular, not by our works or merits, (which are none,) but merely and solely by the free grace and favour of God in Christ. True it is, that even this gift of faith, by which we must sue out our pardon in particular, and supplicate for the adoption of the sons of God, was purchased by Christ's death; nor may we sue for it under any other style or form than *propter merita Christi*, "for the merits of Christ." Yet after this plea made, we may not expect to receive this blessing otherwise than *per Jesum Christum*, "through or by Jesus Christ, who was raised from the dead." This grace, this faith, and whatsoever other blessing
463 of God, which Christ by his death hath merited for us, whatsoever is any way conducent to our full and final redemption, descends immediately from the Son of God exalted in his human nature, as from its proper fountain. He was consecrated by his death (and his consecration was accomplished by his resurrection) to be an inexhaustible fountain of life and salvation to

all that truly believe in his death and resurrection from the dead.

Thus we are fallen into the affirmative inference, 'If Christ be risen from the dead, then such as die in Christ shall be raised from death to immortal glory.' The same Almighty power by which Christ was raised unto glory shall be manifested even in these our mortal bodies: *But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the firstfruits of them that slept*, 1 Cor. xv. 20.

9. The inference or implication is, that seeing Christ, whose mortality was clearly testified by his death, was raised up to an endless and immortal life; therefore such as die in Christ (whatsoever in the mean time become of their bodies) shall be raised up to the like life, against which death shall never be able to make any attempt or approach. For as the apostle saith, Rom. xi. 16, *If the firstfruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches.* But we are to remember that there were two sorts of firstfruits appointed by the law; the one of the first corn that was reaped, being ground and made up into loaves, which were offered at the feast of Pentecost; and unto this sort of firstfruits the apostle, Rom. xi. 16, hath reference.

Two sorts of firstfruits appointed by the law.

The other was the offering of green corn when it first begun to bud or ear; and unto this sort of firstfruits our apostle here, in the twentieth verse, hath reference. Christ then is the root, and we are the branches; he is the firstfruits, and we are the aftercrop and harvest. Now as the offering of the firstfruits, that is, of the green corn, was the hallowing of the whole crop; so the resurrection of Christ from the grave was the hallowing or consecration of these our mortal bodies unto that glory and immortality which

shall be at the final resurrection. If God did accept the offering of the firstfruits, it was a pledge unto his people that he would extraordinarily bless the after-crop with large increase; his people might with confidence expect a joyful harvest. To manifest the meaning or fulfilling of this type or legal ceremony in our Saviour, he was raised up from the dead upon that very day in the morning wherein the firstfruits of green corn were by the priests of the law offered unto God. His resurrection (as was said before) was the accomplishment of his consecration to the priesthood after the order of Melchisedec; his presentation of himself to his Father as our high priest, and as the firstfruits from the dead, was the most acceptable offering or sacrifice that ever was offered unto God; a matter of greater joy and triumph to all the inhabitants of heaven, than Isaac's safe return from the intended sacrifice was to Abraham's family, or than Joseph's advancement in Egypt was to old Jacob. Now if the firstfruits from the dead were thus acceptable unto God, we cannot distrust but that the after-crop shall prosper, and shall be gathered by the angels of God (when the time of ripeness shall come) into everlasting habitations. However in the mean time it be sown, it shall be reaped in glory, and possess its glory in immortality.

This article then of Christ's resurrection from the dead, and of his becoming the firstfruits of them that sleep, is the ground or root of all our apostle's inferences, from verse 35. to the end of this chapter, concerning the resurrection, or the estate of their
464 bodies, that shall be raised to life; but of these we have spoken at large before: the sum of all is intimated by our Saviour himself, John xii. 23, 24: *The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified. Verily,*

verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. Thus much likewise was foretold by the prophet Isaiah in that evangelical prophecy, Isaiah liii. 10: *When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand.* Now this *pleasure of the Lord* was our full redemption.

10. To conclude this point[p]; albeit our sins were taken away by Christ's death in both the senses before mentioned; and albeit in this life we be actually justified, that is, actually acquitted from the guilt of sins past by belief in Christ's death and resurrection; and freed likewise from the rage and tyranny of sin by participation of his grace, and inhabitation of his Spirit in us; yet shall we not be absolutely and finally justified, that is, freed from all relics of sin inherent, until we be made partakers of his glory: this must be the accomplishment of our justification by faith in this life: and it is no paradox or strange opinion to say, that we sinful men shall be finally justified by utter extirpation of sin out of our nature at our last resurrection: whenas Christ himself, in whom sin never took any root, much less bore any branch, into whom no seed of sin did ever fall, is said to be justified by his resurrection from the dead, that is, acquitted from all burden of our sins.

But where is Christ said in this sense to be justified? In the 1 Tim. iii. 16: *Without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit.* To omit all other interpretation of this phrase, St. Paul means the very selfsame thing by saying *Christ is justified*

[p] See parag. 7. [p. 318. of this volume.]

in the Spirit, that St. Peter means when he saith, ***He was quickened in the Spirit***, 1 Pet. iii. 18. Both mean, that he was justified or freed by the Spirit or power of the Godhead from death, or any other further burden of our sins. *Christ*, saith St. Paul, Heb. ix. 28, *was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation:* that is, to free us from the power of death, and all burden of sin, from which he himself was freed at his resurrection. So then it is in its time and place most true, which the Romish church doth most untruly teach, that there is a justification by inherent righteousness. But this justification cannot be had, may not be expected in this life; it cannot be accomplished in us until that change be wrought whereof our apostle speaks, verse 51 of this chapter. This final justification by this blessed change is the full effect or final issue of Christ's resurrection from the dead: he that doth not believe this future change or final issue of Christ's resurrection, doth bear false testimony of God, or against him, even whilst he saith that he believeth that Christ was raised from the dead. For to grant Christ's resurrection from the dead, and to deny or doubt of this final justification or absolution of all true believers in his resurrection from the relics of sin, is to cast an aspersion upon God himself, as if he had wrought this great work of Christ's resurrection, *frustra;* that is, to no use or end correspondent to such a mighty groundwork or foundation.

11. Every man then is bound to believe, that all true believers of Christ's resurrection from the dead shall be undoubted partakers of that endless and immortal glory unto which Christ hath been raised. But
465 no man is bound to believe his own resurrection in

particular unto such glory any further, or upon more certain terms, than he can (upon just and deliberate examination) find that he himself doth truly and steadfastly believe this fundamental article of Christ's resurrection from the dead. Now if it were certainly determined and agreed upon by all what it were truly and steadfastly to believe this article, all the controversies concerning the certainty of salvation, or irrevocable justification, in this life, by faith, would determine themselves, and be at an end. But of the examination of our faith, or of its truth, sincerity, or strength, we shall have fitter occasion and more full time to speak in unfolding of the last part of the article of Christ's coming to judgment; that is, the manner of the process in the award of final sentence.

In the mean time it shall suffice to admonish the reader, that he rate not the truth, or measure the strength of his belief in this main article of Christ's resurrection[q], only by the strength of his persuasions of its speculative and general truth; specially in the absence of temptations to the contrary, or whiles it is opposed to the exceptions of atheists or infidels, which deny or oppugn it. How then must the truth or strength of our belief or faith in this article be measured? Only by our steadfast and constant practice of the special duties whereunto the belief of it doth bind all professors of it. Now the special duties whereunto the belief of it doth bind us are succinctly and pithily set down by our apostle, Col. iii. 1, 2: *If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth*, &c. And verse the 5th: *Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication,*

[q] How we may try ourselves; see book 10. chap. 28. 30. [vol. x. pp. 193. 207.]

uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry. And verses 8, 9: *Put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds.* All of us have put off the old man by profession and solemn vow at our baptism; and a double woe or curse shall befall us, unless we put him off in practice and resolution, and labour to *put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him.*

The particular limbs of this new man are set forth unto us by our apostle, verses 13, 14: *Forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man have a quarrel against any: even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.* The particular duties required of men and women, according to their several conditions or states of life, (as of wives to husbands, and of husbands to wives—as of children to parents, and of parents to children—of servants to masters, and of masters to servants,) are set down by the same apostle in the verses following unto the end of the chapter.

Now we must be altogether as certain that we do truly, sincerely, and constantly perform these duties which are by our apostle in this place required (whether as general to all Christians, or such as concern particular estates of life) as we are of this general, 'That whosoever doth truly mortify the deeds of the body, and perform the other duties here required, shall be undoubted partaker of the resurrection unto glory,' before we can be certain, *certitudine fidei*, "by certainty of faith," of our salvation or resurrection unto glory in particular.

12. Doth any amongst us, upon the examination

required before the receiving of the sacrament, find 466
himself extremely negligent or generally defective in performance of these duties? Let not such a one take his negligence past as any sign or undoubted mark of reprobation; yet would I withal advise him not to approach the Lord's table without a wedding garment, without a sincere and hearty sorrow for his negligences past, without a sincere hearty desire of doing better hereafter. If consciousness of former negligence in these duties, or of practices contrary unto them, be seasoned with sorrow and hearty desire of amendment; the point whereon I would advise such a man for the present to pitch his faith, shall not be his own election, nor the certainty of his present and future estate in grace, or real and infallible interest in Christ's resurrection; but upon that character or description of our Saviour given by the evangelical prophet, Isaiah xlii. 3, and experienced upon record by the evangelist St. Matthew, xii. 20, *that he quencheth not smoking flax; that he will not shake the bruised reed:* remember, that as the second resurrection unto glory must be wrought by virtue of Christ's resurrection from the dead; so the first resurrection, from the dead works of sin unto newness of life, must be wrought by the participation of his body which was given, and of his blood which was shed for us. Remember that by his death and passion he became not only the ransom, but the sovereign medicine for all our sins; a medicine for our sins of wilfulness and commission, to make us more wary not to offend; a medicine for our sins of negligence and omission, to make us more diligent in the works of piety; and the time and place appointed for the receiving of the body and blood of Christ, is the time and place appointed by him for our cure. Heal us then, O Lord, and we shall be healed. Thou, O Lord, who hast *abolished death, and brought*

life and immortality to light through the gospel, enliven and enlighten our hearts by thy Spirit; and in them, thus enlightened, kindle a love of doing thy will; bring good intentions to good desires, and good desires to firm resolutions; and confirm our resolutions with constancy and perseverance in thy service. Amen.

"Almighty God, which hast given thine only Son to die for our sins, and to rise again for our justification; mercifully grant, that we both follow the example of his patience, and be made partakers of his resurrection; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

"Almighty God, give us grace that we may cast away the works of darkness, and put upon us the armour of light, now in the time of this mortal life, in which thy Son Jesus Christ came to visit us in great humility; that in the last day, when he shall come again in his glorious Majesty to judge both the quick and dead, we may rise to the life immortal, through him who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, now and ever. Amen."

467

SECTION V.

Of the Article of Everlasting Life.

A Transition of the Publisher of the folio edition.

WE are now, by the good hand of God upon the work, arrived at the fifth section; a very considerable part of this eleventh book. The subject matter of this section (according to what was cut out by the method proposed in the oft mentioned ninth chapter) is, the final doom, award, or sentence of life and death, which the King of Glory, our most worthy Judge Eternal, shall respectively pronounce and pass upon all at that

dreadful and yet joyful day of judgment; when he shall deal and distribute palms and prizes, crowns and a kingdom, to the little (or, in comparison, the less) flock or sheep set at his right hand, for whom such good things were prepared from the foundation of the world: but utter extermination to the goats on the left hand, whom he will send accursed into everlasting prisons, there to be tormented in that fire which was first prepared (not for them, but) for their tempter and tormentors, the devil and his angels.

I confess our great author closes not with the point of everlasting life till he come to the twentieth chapter. But I thought myself bound here to insert the three next chapters, viz. the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth, for these reasons following:

1. Because they be three, and the first three of thirteen excellent and most elaborate tracts, all in order, composed upon the sixth chapter to the Romans: and pity it was to sever them from the other, with which they so well consort and suit.

2. If I had left out these three, I should not only have done prejudice to the author and his work, but to the reader, (and his content or benefit,) who will find, that these three chapters are as comely and as useful introductions to his rich discourses about the *domus æternitatis*, the two several long homes of all mankind, as any *propylæa* or *areæ* can possibly be to any two houses of this world's building.

3. The doctrine delivered in these three next chapters is so promotive and incentive of Christian piety, and some of it so homogeneal to the ensuing tracts, that they could not be more fitly placed than before the discourses about the final award or sentence.

4. It is my judgment, that had this learned author left none other, these thirteen treatises put together would make a very excellent compend of Christian instruction.

CHAP. XVII.

ROMANS VI. 21, 22, 23.

What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. But now

being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

468 *The connexion of the fifth and sixth chapters. A paraphrase upon this sixth. The importance of the phrase* dead to sin. *No Christians in this life so dead to sin as to come up to the resemblance of death natural. True Christians dead to sin in a proportion to civil death. All Christians (at least all the Romans to whom St. Paul writes did so) in baptism profess themselves dead to sin; and vow death to sin by a true mortification thereof. All have in baptism (or may have) a talent of grace as an antidote and medicine against the deadly infection of sin, as a strengthening to make us victorious over sin.*

Three motives to deter us from the service of sin. 1. *It is fruitless.* 2. *It is shameful.* 3. *It is mortiferous.*

Two motives to engage us in God's service. 1. *Present and sweet fruit unto holiness.* 2. *Future happiness.*

The model or scope of the whole chapter.

THESE three verses being the close or binding of all the rest in this chapter, or as the solid angle in which there is a punctual and full coincidence of all the former lines, I must be enforced to exhibit unto the reader a model or abstract of the whole, before I can shew him the true connexion or references between these later and the foregoing verses. And the model or abstract of the whole chapter is this:

Our apostle had given up this conclusion as the main aphorism or resultance of the fifth chapter, vv. 20, 21, *Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.* Now whether it were to check that preposterous inference which some had already made of this doctrine when first it was delivered unto them, (for it was delivered before he wrote

this epistle,) or whether it were to prevent the making of it upon the reading of the former chapter, our apostle propounds that objection (which either had been or might be made against the former doctrine) in the beginning of this sixth chapter; and he propounds it by way of interrogation: *What shall we say then? shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound?* Rom. vi. 1. And he gives the answer unto it in the second verse by an *absit, God forbid;* that is, far be it from us, far be it from every Christian thus to resolve, thus to infer, say, or think. And to shew the absurdity of that inference, he adds this reason; *How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?*

But this refutation may seem to participate more of rhetorical passion or indignation than of sound and logical reason; an artificial evasion rather than a concludent proof. For these Romans might have demanded of him, What just fear is there that we shall, what possibility that we can, live any longer in sin, if, as you suppose, we be already dead unto it? Only prove what you suppose or take as granted, that we are already dead to sin, or that sin is dead in us, and we shall make just proof that we neither do nor can live any longer in it, that it doth not, neither shall it, live in us.

Of death to sin.

2. All the question then is, (and a great question it is, upon whose true resolution, the resolution of all the questions or difficulties which are emergent out of this and other chapters depends,) in what sense every true Christian is said to be dead to sin; as St. Paul supposeth all these Romans were, which were true members of the true visible church.

A natural and a civil death.

Of death, there be but two sorts or kinds usually known or acknowledged; the one a natural, the other

469 a civil death. He that is dead according to a natural death, is utterly deprived of all sense or motion; he cannot feel, he cannot taste, he cannot smell, see, or hear; his heart pants not, his lungs cease to send forth any breath. And according to this kind of death St. Paul himself could not be accounted dead to sin: sin was not so fully mortified or put to death in him, but that it had its motions in his inward parts; and these motions he by experience felt.

But there is a civil as well as a natural death; and many are said to be civilly dead whose natural life is yet sound and entire. Thus men which are condemned or sentenced to die, are said to be dead in law, albeit the execution or taking away of their natural life be a long time deferred. The like we say of men which have been free born, but afterwards fall into slavery or bondage. Both these sorts of men are said to be dead in law, or to be subject to civil death, because they cannot do or make any legal act either to the benefit of their friends or posterity, or to the prejudice of their enemies. Of any civil contract or legal deed they are as uncapable, as he that is naturally dead is of breathing, sense, or motion. And according to this acception or importance of death, every one in whom the reign or dominion of sin is broken, in whom the flesh is made subject to the spirit, is truly said to be dead to sin; that is, in every man thus qualified, sin is put unto a civil, though not unto a natural death.

But neither is this civil death the death here punctually meant by St. Paul, when he saith, ***How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?*** For he speaks not of such a death to sin as was peculiar to himself or to some few, but of such a death as was common to all these Romans, and to every true member of the visible church. He doth not suppose (nor

was it imaginable) that all of them to whom he wrote were thus actually dead to sin, or that sin did not or could not reign in some of them; at least it may and doth to this day reign in many which have by baptism been admitted into the visible church; whereas our apostle's reason equally concerns all that are baptized. All and every one of them are in his sense and meaning in this place dead to sin; and yet are not all of them dead to sin, or sin dead to them, or in them, either by a natural or civil death. In all of them sin retains some life or being; in many of them it still retains its sovereignty or dominion. How then are all of them, how are all of us, that have been baptized, dead to sin? Thus in the first place.

Death to sin is vowed by us in baptism.

3. All of them did solemnly promise and vow to mortify the deeds of the body, as we now do. But so may others do which never meant to be baptized. It is true; and therefore the full and only reason why these Romans (one and other) were reckoned as dead to sin, was not because they had promised or vowed to mortify the deeds of the flesh, or to put sin unto a civil death, that is, to break the reign or dominion of it: for thus to promise or thus to vow without sufficient means or probable hopes, such hopes and means as by nature they could not have to perform what they thus vow, were presumption, a tempting of God, and provocation of Satan, to take that opportunity which they themselves offer to assault them. To compel all that come unto the sacred laver to undertake that treble vow, (which is and hath been always solemnly made and undertaken either by the parties themselves, which are to be baptized, in case they be of years, or by their sureties,) were the part rather of a cruel stepdame than the office of a loving mother, unless the church, our mother, which exacts this vow of all and

every one, could give full assurance to all and every one of her sons, that God in baptism for his part never fails to give means sufficient for quelling the reign of sin, for mortifying the deeds of the body: means (I mean) sufficient not in themselves only, but sufficient to every one of us, unless we will be defective unto ourselves.

Means also of dying to sin received in baptism.

Now add this reason unto the former, and you have the true and full meaning of our apostle, when he saith, that all that are baptized are dead to sin; that is, first they are dead unto it by solemn vow or profession; secondly, they are said to be *dead unto sin*, or sin to be dead in them, inasmuch as they in baptism receive an antidote from God by which the rage and poison of it might easily be assuaged or expelled; so they would not either receive that grace or means which God in baptism exhibits unto them in vain, or use it amiss. So we may say that any popular disease is quelled or taken away, after a sovereign remedy be found against it, which never fails, so men will seek for it, seasonably apply it, and observe that diet which the physician upon the taking of it prescribes unto them.

Of baptismal grace.

4. Some in our times there be (and more I think than have been in all the former) which deny all baptismal grace. Others there be which grant some grace to be conferred by baptism, even unto infants; but yet these restrain it only to infants elect. And this they take to be the meaning of our church's Catechism, wherein children are taught to believe, that as Christ, the second Person in the Trinity, did redeem them and all mankind, so the Holy Ghost (the third Person) doth sanctify them and all the elect people of God.

But can any man be persuaded that it was any part of our church's meaning to teach children, when they first make profession of their faith, to believe that they

are of the number of the elect, that is, of such as cannot finally perish? This were to teach them their faith backwards, and to seek the kingdom of heaven not *ascendendo*, by ascending, but *descendendo*, by descending from it. For higher than thus St. Paul himself in his greatest perfection could not possibly reach; no, nor the blessed angels which have kept their first station almost these 6000 years. Yet certain it is, that our church would have every one at the very first profession of his faith to believe that he is one of the elect people of God.

Difference betwixt the elect and the elect people of God.

But those reverend fathers which did compose that Catechism, and the church our mother which did approve and authorize it, did in charity presume, that every one which would take upon him to expound this Catechism, or other principles of faith, should first know the distinction between the elect, that is, such persons as cannot perish, and the elect people of God; or between election unto God's ordinary grace or means of salvation, and election unto eternal glory. Every people or nation, every company of men, when they are first converted from Gentilism to Christianity become an elect people, a chosen generation or company of men; that is, they and their seed after them are made capable of baptism, receive an interest in God's promises made unto us in Christ, which the heathens whilst they continue heathens cannot have. And all of us are in baptism thus far sanctified, that we are made true members of the visible church, qualified for hearing the word, for receiving the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, and whatsoever benefits of Christ's priestly function are committed to the dispensation of his ministers. And thus far sanctified by baptism no man can be but by the Holy Ghost. Our apostle saith, 1 Cor. vii. 14, that *the unbelieving husband is sancti-*

fied by the believing *wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the* believing *husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy.*

So that he attributes an holiness unto the children
471 of believing parents by which they are more capable of baptism than the children of unbelieving parents are. And of this holiness by which they are capable of baptism all children are partakers, although but one of their parents, whether father or mother, do believe: much more are the children of believing parents to be reputed holy or sanctified after baptism, by which always some gift of the Holy Ghost is conferred upon them. For even that holiness which was communicated or derived unto them from their parents before they were baptized, or by which they became capable of baptism, was conferred upon their parents by baptism.

5. Whether this gift or qualification wherewith the Holy Ghost is said to sanctify all the elect people of God, be, or include in it, the grace of regeneration, I will not dispute. That infants are by baptism regenerated we may not deny, unless we will take upon us to put another sense upon the articles of our church than they will naturally bear. But whether such as were baptized when they came to years of discretion (as most of these Romans were) did in baptism receive the grace of regeneration, or were forthwith regenerated, that I leave unto the schools. It sufficeth us to know the true meaning of our apostle in this place; and this it is: 'All of us in baptism receive a gift or talent which by nature we had not, we could not have. For the use of this talent we shall be called unto a strict account. And when this account shall be taken, it shall go harder with those which either have abused it, misemployed it, or not used it, than

with the Gentiles, heathens, or infidels, which never received the like; *for to whom much is given, of him shall be much required.*

And unless their means to vanquish Satan, the world, and the flesh, had been greater than the mere natural man had any, the just Lord would not punish them more severely than he doth the heathen or mere natural men for suffering themselves to be vanquished by his enemies. They which deny any grace or talent to be always given in baptism, or affirm this talent to be given only to some few which are of the number of the elect, either do not understand or do not call to mind what baptism is. Now baptism on our part is an astipulation or promise (1 Pet. iii. 21.); and it is no less on God's part. It is a mutual covenant or astipulation between God and us. And in every covenant or astipulation there is *ratio dati et accepti*, somewhat given and somewhat taken. The giving is properly on God's part—the taking on ours; for in true and proper terms we cannot give any thing to God, because all we have, even we ourselves, are his by double right, by right of creation and redemption. Yet it is his pleasure that we in baptism should sincerely and heartily surrender that unto him which is his own, even ourselves, our souls, and bodies. And he upon this surrender or vow, if it be sincerely made, doth give to us that which was not ours, even his only Son, with all the benefits of his death and passion. All of us put him on in baptism, though not all in the same degree; and we may rest assured that God would never press us in baptism to fight under the banner of his Son, unless he were ready to furnish us with strength, with weapons, and skill to fight his battles. So we will (as our apostle exhorts us) yield our mem-

In baptism there is a mutual astipulation or promise between God and man.

bers unto his service, he will teach our hands to war, and our fingers to fight, and every faculty of our body and soul to do their part.

6. The abstract or brief of our apostle's discourse in this chapter is to stir up that gift of God in these Romans which they had received in baptism; or, which is all one, to animate or encourage them to employ that talent, which God in that sacrament had concredited unto them, unto his glory. And this his
472 exhortation is grounded upon their profession of dying to sin which they had made in baptism; or upon the assurance of God's Spirit in the sacred war, so we will take heart and courage to undertake the fight. There is not one branch of this exhortation from the second verse of this chapter to this one and twentieth, but is rooted in one of these two considerations, or jointly in both. That all of us in baptism are dead to sin, (in that sense which we have shewed before,) that is, by solemn vow, or by professing our death unto it, our apostle infers, ver. 3; and not only dead, but buried. And both this death and burial unto sin was solemnly professed, not by word or vow only, but by matter of fact or visible ceremony then usual in baptism; for every one that was baptized (seeing all that were baptized were of good years, and strength of body to undergo this ceremony) were *ter demersi in aquis*, their whole bodies were plunged thrice in the water, to represent their vowed death and burial unto sin.

Ceremonies used at baptism, and the meaning thereof.

This ternal demersion of their bodies, as some collect, was not only to represent the holy and blessed Trinity of the divine persons in whose names they were baptized, but withal to represent the three several days wherein Christ lay buried in the grave. *Therefore*, saith the apostle, *we are buried with him by*

baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. ver. 4.

7. The meaning of the former ceremony was, and so of baptism to this day is, that as Christ did leave the burden of our sins, and put off the form of a servant, which for our sakes he undertook, in the grave; so we, by baptism and burial into his death, should put off the old man or body of sin, and be raised unto newness of life, and become partakers of his resurrection unto glory.

This raising unto newness of life by the sacrament of baptism was represented by the safe ascension of their bodies out of the water in the which they had been thrice plunged. And of our resurrection unto glory, we receive the pledge or earnest when we receive the grace of regeneration, that is, the grace which enables us to walk in newness of life. And this is called the *first resurrection*, without which no man shall be partaker of the second unto glory. Now that all such as are truly *buried with him by baptism into death*, that is, all such as observe and perform their vow made in baptism, shall undoubtedly be partakers of his resurrection unto glory, the apostle infers, ver. 5: *For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection:* and ver. 6; *Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin*, ver. 7; that is, he that is dead to sin in this life is freed from the life or reign of sin. For it is observable that he doth not say, if we have been *planted together in his death*, but, if we have been *planted together in the likeness of his death*. It is not required that we should die

the death of the body as Christ did, but to die as Isaac did, in the similitude and figure of his death; that is, we should die to sin, or crucify that sin in us, for which Christ was crucified. And as it is not required that we should die the death of the body in baptism; so is it not to be expected that we should forthwith be raised unto that glory whereunto he rose, but to be raised unto a similitude or likeness of it; that is, unto newness of life, which is the first resurrection. And of this resurrection we shall not fail to be actual partakers by virtue of baptism, if we be rightly implanted into the similitude of his death; for so the apostle's words are: *If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.*

473 But what is it to be σύμφυτοι, *planted together?* or with whom are we planted? we Gentiles, together with the Jews? So some conjecture. But the more ancient and better exposition is, that we are σύμφυτοι with Christ, planted together with him; yet not so planted together with him as one tree is planted together by another, (*arbor inter*, or *juxta arbores*,) each having its several root. But as Christ was planted by his death and burial, and consecrated to be the root of life; so we likewise should be planted by baptism in him to die to sin, and being so planted in his death, to be partakers of his resurrection unto life: as the implanted graft which loseth leaf and sap and (to outward view) life also in winter, with the branch or stock into which it was planted, doth recover all again when the root sends back the sap at the spring or the resurrection of the year.

8. This is that which our Saviour himself had said, John xv. 4, 5: *As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye,*

except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. That is, ye have no root in yourselves, and therefore no life, but as you are planted in me, the vine. Now this vine was opened in his death upon the cross, and planted in his burial; and from him so planted, that of the psalmist, psalm lxxxv. 11, was fulfilled, *Righteousness did grow out of the earth;* and we being ingrafted or inoculated into him thus planted, become true branches of the same vine. Branches we are, but without root in ourselves: all the life we can hope for must be derived from his root.

And the very sum and proper effect of our belief in his death and resurrection is set down by our apostle, Rom. vi. 8—11: *Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

So then if all which are baptized are dead to sin by solemn vow, every one must know it to be his duty to mortify his earthly members; but none are bound to believe that they are already actually dead to sin because they are baptized. The sum of our apostle's exhortation in the twelfth verse is, *Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the*

dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.

The height of our hopes in this life is, to put sin unto a civil death; that is, to bring the flesh in subjection to the spirit. And this we may and ought to hope for; so saith the apostle, ver. 14: *Sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace.* And grace is able to give us that victory over sin which the law could not, if we will submit ourselves unto the regiment of grace, and not presume of God's favour in consciousness of sin. This is that which the apostle rejects with the like indignation (vv. 15, 16.) as he had done the former imagination, *of continuing in sin that grace might abound. What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid. Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?* His meaning is, that albeit they were by baptism translated from the regiment of the law unto the regiment of grace; yet if, by presuming upon God's grace or favour, they continue in sin, they shall cease to be God's servants, and become again the servants of sin.

The regiment of the law and of grace.

474 9. It is the observation of Prosper (an ancient writer) upon this place; ‘That as no man can serve two masters, so every man must serve one of these two, either sin or righteousness, God or Satan; and he that is a servant to the one is exempted from the service of the other. He that is a servant of righteousness is freed from sin; and he that is a servant unto sin is rather exempted than freed from the service of righteousness.’ Both are avouched by our

Prosper's observation.

apostle, but with this difference, that being made free from sin, they were made the servants of righteousness; but when they were the servants of sin, they were free, not from righteousness, but to righteousness; that is, they did righteousness no service, *de facto*, but used their freedom rather to wrong it.

But God be thanked (saith our apostle, ver. 17.), *that ye were the servants of sin.* A strange kind of speech! The Pharisee indeed did thank God that he was no extortioner, no covetous person, nor tainted with such sins as he thought the publican was; but we never read that any Pharisee, publican, or other, did thank God that he was an extortioner, or that he was a grievous sinner; nor would God questionless accept of such thanks: for he expects no thanks but for the good which he doth unto the children of men. Now to be a covetous person, to be an extortioner, to be a servant to sin, are things which have no goodness in them; therefore no works of God, no part of his doings. How then doth the apostle so solemnly thank God on these Romans' behalf, that they *were the servants of sin;* or is this his thanksgiving to be referred only to the latter part of that 17th verse; *but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.* This indeed was worthy of thanks: yet not this alone. The form of thanksgiving refers as properly and punctually to the first part of the verse, *God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin*, as it doth to the latter part, *but ye have obeyed that form of doctrine which was delivered you.*

And in the first place, it refers to their former servitude unto sin. For though God were not the author of their servitude to sin, as he was of their obedience to the doctrine of life; yet his goodness did turn their former servitude to sin, the very worst deed which

they had done, unto their good. For take them as now they were, it was better for them that they had been *the servants of sin*, than not to have been so. God, you must consider, at this time required the service of righteousness at their hands. And he that hath been a diligent servant to an hard and cruel master, from whom he could not in reason expect any recompense worth his toil, is thereby well enapted and trained to be diligent and faithful in the service of a gentle, loving, and bountiful master. Such was the case and state of these Romans. They had done extraordinary kindness for a long time unto sin; and this their service was not only lost in respect of times past, but very dangerous in the future. Upon this known case or experiment among men, doth our apostle ground those forcible exhortations in the verses precedent, which he most strongly concludes with the words of the 21st verse. *I speak* (saith he, ver. 19.) *after the manner of men because of the infirmity of your flesh: for as ye have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity unto iniquity; even so now yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness. For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness;* that is, you did acknowledge no service due unto it. The implication, which he expresseth not, is this: 'Being now become the servants of righteousness, do as little service unto sin as when you were its servants ye did to righteousness; acknowledge none to it, for none is due to it, especially from you.'

475 10. But in the 21st verse, if you mark his placing of the words well, he puts the case home; *What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed?* What fruit had ye *then*, at that time when ye did them with greediness? If the service of sin at

any time were fruitful, it is questionless then whilst it is a doing. For this Delilah hath the trick to wipe off all shame from her lovers' faces whilst sin is in the action or motion. But our apostle proves this service of sin to be fruitless even then, because now, when these motions were past, it makes them ashamed.

Nor is the service of sin fruitless only because it bringeth forth shame, but therefore more than shameful, full of danger and dread, because the shame which it bringeth forth is always the harbinger or forerunner of death. For so the apostle adds; *for the end of those things is death.* These are the best fruits of their service to sin; and sin itself is more than fruitless, because the best fruits which it seems to bring are poisonous. But now these Romans are called unto the service of a far better master; one from whom they have somewhat *in re*, but much more *in spe;* a bountiful earnest, for the present, of an invaluable recompense and future reward, ver. 22: *But now being made free from sin, and become servants to God, ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.*

And finally, he binds all his former exhortations with this undoubted assertion; *For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord,* ver. 23.

Thus you have seen the duty whereunto we stand bound by our baptism.

And it is twofold: 1. to forsake the devil, the world, and the flesh; and secondly, to betake ourselves to the service of God.

The motives to withdraw us from this service of sin are three: the service of it, first, is fruitless; 2. it is shameful; 3. it causeth death; to wit, a most shameful, bitter, and endless death.

The motives to draw us unto the service of God are two: 1. the present fruit which it yieldeth, viz. the peace of conscience, or that righteousness which is the flower and blossom unto holiness; 2. the final reward, which is a most blessed life without end. The first three motives to withdraw us from the service of sin are as it were linked or mortised one into another. The very fruitlessness of sin's service shuts up into shame; and the shame arresting or seizing upon the sinner is no other than the very harbinger, forerunner, or sergeant of death.

CHAP. XVIII.

ROMANS VI. 21.

What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death, &c.

Of the Fruitlessness of Sin. Of the Shame that follows and dogs sin, as the Shadow doth the Body. What Shame is; whence it ariseth; and what Use may be made thereof. Of Fame, Praise, and Honour. Satan's Stales, false Shame and false Honour. The Character of both in Greek and Latin. Of Pudor, *which is always* male facti; *of* Verecundia, *which may sometimes be* de modo recte facti. Periit vir cui pudor periit. Erubuit, salva res est.

1. We are here to speak somewhat to the first point, which was the fruitlessness of sin; of which more afterwards.

476 It was an ancient saying of a good writer, *Præstat otiosum esse quam nihil agere:* "It were better to sit still and do nothing, than to busy and weary ourselves to no purpose." A shame it is in itself, but commonly the beginning of a far greater shame, to spend our time without any fruit. And if we could persuade a man that for the present he labours in vain, that for the future he can expect nothing but wearisome trouble for his long pains, it would be enough to make him

(if he have any wit) ashamed of what he hath done, more than enough (unless he be impudent) to make him give over what he hath begun. Yea, he is not a wise man that doth not forecast some probable hopes or gainful issues of his labours before he begin them. So our Saviour tells us, Luke xiv. 28, 29, 30: *For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? Lest haply, after he hath laid the foundation, and is not able to finish it, all that behold it begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish.* If want of forecast to go through with a work which in the beginning promised fruit, be a shame, or expose men to scorn or mockery; what is it to begin and continue those works, whose accomplishing or finishing is more fruitless than the first beginning? So that the service of sin is in this respect shameful, because it is fruitless. But if you observe our apostle well, he doth not infer that the works of sin are shameful because they are fruitless, but that they are fruitless because they are shameful. Shame, and that a positive shame, is the natural fruit or issue of all service to sin; and not every kind of positive shame; but a shame accompanied or seconded with death.

That the apostle's argument may have its full weight or sway upon our souls, we are in the first place to examine what shame properly is; secondly, what manner of death it is which is the wages of sin.

Of shame, what it is, and whence arising.

2. Shame is a fear of some evil to ensue, or an impression of some evil present; the fear of whose continuance is more grievous than any present smart. But though all shame be a fear or sense of evil, yet every fear or sense of evil doth not cause shame. Men naturally fear the loss of goods; but, as our Saviour

intimates, Matt. vi. 25, most naturally the loss of their lives. Yet if our goods be taken from us by violence, we are not ashamed of it: the expectation or sufferance of this evil causeth only sorrow or grief to us; it causeth shame to him that doth it. There is no man almost but feareth a violent and undeserved death; yet if such a death be set before him, it causeth only sorrow or heaviness of heart; a dejection of spirit; no shame or confusion of face. Such as die guiltless are rather comforted than confounded at the sight or presence of others. That evil, whose sight moveth pity and compassion in others, cannot breed shame to him that suffers it. [r]Shame then is a fear of such evil only which consists in disgrace, or loss of reputation; and is opposed to honour, fame, or praise. Now the desire of honour, fame, or praise, is the strongest motive, the sharpest spur to animate men (especially of better spirits) to undertake any danger, to undergo any evil, that is free from disgrace, or not charged with shame. His rule in the general was exceeding good, though misapplied to him and to his followers' case; *Præstat per virtutem emori, quam per dedecus vivere:* "It is better to die with credit, than to live with shame." And this wrought so deeply with him and his soldiers, that never any died with greater resolution than they did; though all were slain, yet every man fell in his own rank. But many Romans and other heathens, less furious than Catiline and his soldiers were, have voluntarily submitted
477 themselves to the lingering tortures of death without any other motive to undergo or endure them, besides the desire of fame and honour. Now the desire of fame cannot be so sharp a spur to make men adventure

[r] See Aristotle, Rhet. lib. 2. cap. 6. Ethic. Nic. lib. 4. cap. 15.

upon noble enterprises, though full of danger; but the fear or apprehension of shame will be as strong a curb to withdraw them from lewd and naughty courses. And if the ministers of the gospel, who are God's ambassadors, or the magistrate, who is his deputy, had no other hank or curb over men committed to their charge than this, this alone would be sufficient to keep the most of them from gross exorbitances or outrageous courses, did not Satan, the world, and flesh, still set up their stales or counterfeit pictures of shame, to drive men the contrary way to that whereto we seek by representation of true shame to draw them.

Satan's stales, false honour, and false shame.

3. The heathen poet could vauntingly say, that none but fools were either lifted up with false honour or dejected with slanderous infamy:

> Falsus honor juvat et mendax infamia terret
> Quem nisi mendosum et mendacem? ———
>
> *Hor.* Epist. I. xvi. 39.

But it is a sad truth, whereof we daily have experiment, that the main conflict in our Christian warfare is between that honour which one man seeks to receive from another, and that honour which cometh from God alone; between the fear of shame and disgrace from men, and that disgrace or shame which is the award of divine justice. Painted honour and counterfeit shame still command in chief (as it were by course) for the flesh, the world, and the devil. Nothing is truly shameful, but *malum culpæ*, but that which is evil or dishonest, and against the commandments of God. The only constant rule for knowing what deserveth shame, what not, is the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments. But this is a rule which will not be easily applied unto particulars, otherwise than by way of catechism; and by this way, God willing, it may be had hereafter.

In the mean time, for those that be parents of children, or fathers of families, one of the best catechisms which they can read unto their children or other relations in private, the best preparation to the more immediate grounds of religion, which they can plant in any committed to their charge, would be, to inure them to modesty whilst their affections are pliable; to teach them both by word and example, of what things they ought to be ashamed, and wherein to rejoice or glory.

Aristotle in the second of his Ethics, cap. 3, gives this up as the brief or compend of right education: —χαίρειν τε καὶ, λυπεῖσθαι οἷς δεῖ· ἡ γὰρ ὀρθὴ παιδεία αὕτη ἐστίν· and Siracides sets down (Ecclesiasticus xli.) a large catalogue or roll of those things whereof it is a shameful thing not to be ashamed: and another smaller table of such things whereof men ought not to be ashamed, chap. xlii. If those that are *in parendi sortem geniti*, and should be under discipline, be suffered to shake off this curb or bridle (modesty or fear of shame) whilst they are young, not only parents and masters, but magistrates and ministers shall find them past rule and government, when they grow elder and stronger. There is no loss can happen to man in this life so grievous as the loss of shamefacedness and modesty, especially in youth.

Shame and modesty.

4. That disposition of mind which in our English we call *shame* and *modesty*, or *shamefacedness*, hath two characters in the Greek, αἴδως and αἰσχύνη; the former, the Latins express by the word *verecundia;* the latter, by *pudor*. This difference the grammarians
478 observe between them, that the former, *verecundia*, is sometime *recte facti*, there may be a modest fear, at least for the manner of doing that which in itself is not evil, but not so comely, the circumstances of time

and place, especially the place of our betters being considered; *pudor* is always *male facti*. We are not, or ought not, to be ashamed but for that which is evil. So that *pudor* is opposed to moral filthiness or naughtiness, as *verecundia* is to unseemliness, or uncomeliness: both of them agree in the general, both are a fear of some censure; but *pudor*, or *shame*, is *metus vituperii*, "a fear of reproach" or infamy for doing that which in itself is evil.

That disposition which the Latins call *verecundia* was incident to man in his first and pure estate: the very angels cover their faces at the presence of God. And so no doubt but children should have borne an awful and modest respect unto their parents, and have been afraid to do those things in their presence, which done out of their presence had not been evil or unseemly. But that which the Latins call *pudor* had found no entrance into our nature, unless sin had made it one. Our nature had been sufficiently guarded by its original integrity against just fear of infamy or disgrace. But taking our nature as now it is, polluted with sin, and stained with filthiness, the fear of disgrace or infamy is no prejudice, but rather an advantage to it. It is a qualification which makes men more capable of rule or government than any reasonless creature is, none of which are capable of this qualification.

5. The life of government or jurisdiction consists in the right dispensation of *pœna* and *præmium*, that is, of punishment and reward. And in every well governed commonwealth fame and honour are the top branches of reward; wealth or bodily contentments are but supporters unto it. Many otherways well ordered commonwealths, might err (as most heathen commonwealths did) in defining what true

honour was, or wherein true honour did consist. They did not err in determining honour as the chief reward or crown of well doing; nor did they err in making disgrace or infamy as the special branch of punishment. Mulcts, or loss of goods, loss of life, or bodily torture, come but in the second or third place: fear of infamy and hope of honour were of themselves sufficient to keep most men within the compass of civility or moral goodness, were it not generally true in all commonwealths which Solomon had observed in his times, Prov. xxviii. 4, that *they which forsake the law praise the wicked;* and so St. Peter tells us, 1 Epist. iv. 4, that such as walked in the ways of the Gentiles, in lasciviousness, lust, excess of wine, riotings, banquetings and abominable idolatry, did think it a strange thing, that these late converts, to whom he wrote this Epistle, did not run with them to the like excess. And for this cause, as he adds, they speak evil of them; that is, they put all the shame they could upon them.

As then, so now, every society of lewd or naughty men have their usurped customs, which are equivalent with them to laws; have their parliaments, whereby (*woe unto them,* Isaiah v. 20.) they attempt to alter or invert the law of God and the law of nature; to establish evil for good, and to disgrace goodness as if it were evil.

What course of life, what branch of lewdness more infamous, by the law of God, than riot or drunkenness? a vice so shameful, that the father's eye must not pity it in his children that are tainted with it, but even their natural parents, as well the mother as the father,
479 are bound by the law of God (Deut. xxi. 20, 21.) to inform against them, to accuse them before the magistrate, lest the shame and sin should reflect upon them-

selves by connivance. And by the same law the public magistrate is bound, upon the accusation of their parents, to put them to an ignominious death. And yet there is a generation of men, outwardly professing the knowledge of God and of Christ, which seek to put shame and ignominy upon all such as will not run with them to the like excess; which have their laws and rules for authorizing and cherishing this lawless and unruly custom.

God again by his written law, and by his sentence against Cain, awards death and shame to murderers: and yet the seeds of this accursed sin are more than legitimated—ranked amongst the essential parts of honour—made as the very touch and trial of gentry—by men which esteem it a greater shame to endure the breath of a verbal lie from another's rash mouth, than to tell or devise an hundred real lies, or to outface a truth by false oaths. And by this corrupt custom, which goes current for a sovereign law amongst braver spirits, (as they account themselves,) the observance of laws divine and human (which forbid all private revenge, all resolutions to kill or be killed) is branded with the infamy of cowardice; a terrible bugbear, but to such only as are men in maliciousness, but children in knowledge. For it is a sign of the greatest cowardice that can be, to be affrighted at the noise of vain words, or to forsake the fortress upon a false alarm, or representation of counterfeit colours: as these, so every other vice hath its bawd or advocate to give it countenance, and to disgrace the contrary virtue.

6. The old serpent, which beguiled the first man by the first woman, works still upon the weaker vessel, and makes it his instrument to foil the stronger. He is not ignorant that this *masculus pudor*, as the philo-

sopher calls it, this virile or manly fear of shame, whereby youth is naturally restrained from shameful courses, cannot easily be vanquished, but by suborning this effeminate or womanish fear of worldly or popular disgrace to betray it, as Delilah did her husband Samson. And the expelling of this masculine by this womanish fear of disgrace or reproach, is as the putting out of the eyes of discretion, whereby we discern good from evil. So that Satan leads them up and down at his pleasure, as the Philistines did Samson, after he had lost his bodily eyes, by the cutting off his hair.

We have a saying, or proverb rather, "Past shame, past grace." The heathens had the like observation, save only that they knew not what *grace* meant. They had no use of the word *grace* in that sense which is most common, and yet most proper with us.

A child or man past grace, is, with us, as much as *filius perditus*, "a son of perdition;" such an one as Judas was, who yet was not past grace, that is, not irrecoverably lost, until he became impudent and obdurate in sin. Now it was the observation of one, and he was none of the precisest amongst the heathen,

Illum ego periisse dico, cui quidem periit pudor.

"I give that man" (saith Plautus) "for lost, which hath lost modesty, or is past shame." Our common proverb, and the saying of this poet, have this sure ground in true divinity; That want of modesty, or a face uncapable of shame, supposeth a great measure of iniquity in the breast. That which we call a *brasen face* hath always for its supporter an iron sinew or a brawny heart, Jer. iii. 3. v. 3. vi. 15. viii. 12.

7. As nothing passeth into the understanding but by
480 the gates of sense, so the true belief of that which God

threatened unto sin—and that was death—is ushered into the heart of man by shame and confusion of face. The first impression of God's threatenings unto our first parents was made upon this part. And all the sons of Adam, even unto this day, either have or might have a pledge of that which Moses relates concerning their and their eldest son's hiding themselves, and going out from the presence of the Lord. To this day it is true, *Qui male agit odit lucem;* "An evil conscience flies the light or presence of men;" and the face commonly bewrays the heart; as he said,

Heu quam difficile est crimen non prodere vultu?

It is a hard matter not to confess a crime, or the truth, although the mouth be silent. Yet as some men by long custom in sin degenerate into atheists, and see no relics of God's image (wherein they were created) in themselves, although the notion of a Godhead or divine power be naturally ingrafted in all; so, though shame and blushing be most natural to man when he doth evil, yet some by long continuance in sin shake off this veil or covering of their nakedness. Such they are of whom Jeremiah spake in the Old, and in the New Testament St. Jude speaks, ver. 10: men that are prone to *speak evil of those things which they know not: but what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves*, and become as impenetrable by shame as brute beasts, whom God hath deprived of reason. He that is not subject to this passion participates more of the nature or disposition of collapsed angels than of collapsed man. The devils (we read) do tremble at their belief or apprehension of God's judgments. We do not read that they are ashamed of the evil which deserves it, as our first parents were. It is

true (though) that they, through want of awful respect or reverence unto the divine Majesty, were the authors of sin, and propagators of shame to their posterity. All of us are prone to think that they deserved ill, not of God only, but of us; and yet the truth is, that we lay a great deal more blame upon them than they deserved. They indeed were the first, yet not the greatest sinners. Many of their posterity in this quality go beyond them; all of us imitate them too well in their sin, but not in being ashamed when we sin.

8. They had but one commandment given by God; and having transgressed that, their consciences did accuse them—their very looks and gestures gave evidences against them. We transgress all God's commandments, and one and the same commandment over and over, God only knows how often; yet are not dejected, are not confounded, but bear out sail as if there were no danger: though every thing which God in his written law hath prohibited is a branch of the forbidden tree. He hath as peremptorily forbidden all to have any gods but him—to worship any graven image—to take his name in vain, as he did our first parents to taste of the tree of good and evil: yet even such as would be held the only true catholics, worship images; and such again as would be accounted the pure worshippers of God in truth and spirit, worship their own imaginations, and transform the unchangeable nature of the Deity into unfit similitudes. Little children amongst us are mighty swearers; and nothing more common in public or private than to take God's holy name in vain, to abuse it more grossly than the Jew or heathen could, who knew not God incarnate. And all this they do without any sign of shame. Women rail upon, revile and curse one an-

other in the open streets, until their faces grow red indeed, but with a redness which betokens no shame, which bears no tincture of blush, but rather of re- 481
venge and malice boiling in the heart, or of heat in their tongue, set on fire by hell. But these, for the most part, are of the meaner and baser sort. Others there be, as far transported with misguided zeal from that modesty which becomes their sex; and this zeal they offer up as strange fire unto God without blushing, taking the priest's office upon them, to be more than teachers, censurers of their teachers; swift to hear any doctrine that shall contradict the public voice of the church, always listening after the whisperings of such private spirits as invert the tenor of the gospel, no less than the old serpent did the first commandment which God gave unto mankind. God had said unto them, Gen. iii. 3, *Ye shall not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.* But the serpent whispers, vv. 4, 5, *Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil:*—a plausible comment to her which was now giving the reins to her longing appetite. As plausible a doctrine it is to many of her daughters to meddle with the marks of election and reprobation, secrets which God hath reserved unto himself. Points full of great difficulty and greater danger, and wherein such as have waded furthest, have (as I said before) inverted the tenor of the gospel. For it is the perpetual voice of the gospel, *If thou believe, thou shalt be saved: if thou believest not, thou canst not be saved.* The very sum and final resolution of the doctrine of election, as it is vulgarly taught, is this: 'If thou must be saved, that is, if thou be of the number of the elect or pre-

destinated, thou shalt believe; if thou be not of the number of the elect, thou canst not believe.' To listen after such whisperings as these, the weaker sex take from their mother Eve; but to be confident or presumptuous upon such misinterpretations, or to be censurers of their superiors, this they learn not from their mother Eve, but from her false teacher. This is a prodigious disposition in women, whom the apostle commands *to learn in silence with all subjection*, but will not suffer them *to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man*, 1 Tim. ii. 12. This silence and modesty is enjoined them as a penance for their mother Eve's transgression, vv. 13—15: *For Adam*, saith the apostle, *was first formed, then Eve. And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved* (σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας) *by the promised seed, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.* These are the means to make their election sure.

9. All of us, both men and women, are too prone to imitate our first parents in doing that which is evil, and forbidden by the law of God. And seeing better cannot be expected, it were well if we could as truly imitate them in being ashamed of the evil which we have done. They no sooner knew that they were naked, but they sought a covering for their nakedness of fig leaves: but this would not serve: for when *they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden, they hid themselves from his presence amongst the trees.* All of us have an experimental pledge of this, which Moses relates concerning them, in ourselves, unless we choke or stifle the instinct of corrupted nature by long custom or continuance in sin. That our consciences do accuse us, that the sight of men

whom we know or suspect to be conscious of our misdoings dejects us, both these argue that we must appear before a Judge, even before that Judge from whose presence our first parents hid themselves; at whose appearance we shall be confounded, if we come before him polluted with such blots and stains as our 482
souls are ashamed sinful men (such as ourselves are) should look upon. For even that redness or blushing, which appears in men's faces upon consciousness of their infirmities or misdeeds, is but a mask which our souls do naturally put before them, as being afraid lest others should see the stain or blemish of sin.

As our first parents sought to hide themselves from God after they had transgressed his commandments, so offenders hide themselves from his deputies or vicegerents on earth, not only for fear of punishment, but for shame. And if we should give you the real or physical definition of shame, it is no other than the striving of nature to hide the stain of our souls, by sending our blood into the face or visage. And men do but second this dictate of nature, when they put their hands or other covering before their faces. So Disarius, one of the discoursers in Macrobius, saith, *Natura pudore tacta sanguinem ante se pro velamento tendit.* Saturn. lib. 7. cap. 11.

Thus both corrupted nature and we ourselves seek to hide our souls from the view of others, albeit we cannot discern the inward stain or filth of sin, but are rather in love with her painted pleasures: but when he shall appear that knew no sin in himself, and yet knows all the secrets of man's heart, it is no veil of flesh, no die of nature, no covering of the visage with blood, that will avail such as continue to do those things whereof they are or ought to be ashamed, or which they are afraid that others should see or know.

They shall then desire the hills for a veil, and the rocks and mountains for a covering to their shame; but in vain, for perpetual darkness shall be their habitation, and their present shame and confusion of face shall then appear to be the harbinger or forerunner of death.

CHAP. XIX.

ROMANS VI. 21.

What fruit had ye then in those things whereof ye are now ashamed? &c.

We are many Ways engaged to serve God rather than to serve Sin, though Sin could afford us as much Fruit and Reward as God doth. But there is no Proportion, no Ground of Comparison, betwixt the Fruits of Sin and the Gift of God. The Case stated betwixt the voluptuous sensual Life, and the Life truly Christian. Satan's Method and God's Method. A Complaint of the Neglect of Grace.

1. THE scope of our apostle's whole discourse in this chapter is to deter us from the service of sin; and by the help of superabounding grace, and hope of an exceeding great reward, both to encourage and engage our best endeavours unto the service of God. His motion or argument was reasonable, albeit sin (or he that is the author of sin) were able to afford us as much fruit, or as full a recompense, as the service of God doth.

There is no man amongst us of this church, I presume, but doth abhor the heresy of the Manichees, which was in part this, 'that we were beholden to another god for our bodies, than unto him which made our souls.' Yet if their abominable doctrine
483 were (for disputation sake) supposed as true, we could not be by any right so engaged unto the service

of this imaginary god, as unto the service of the true God which made our souls, and doth purify them by his word and sacraments: for we are not debtors to the flesh, but unto the God of the spirits of all flesh we are; debtors indeed unto the only God which made both our bodies and souls and spirits: he may challenge our service by double right.

Our service is due to God upon several titles.

First, by the right of creation, which we had shamefully violated by alienating our allegiance unto his enemy.

Secondly, by right of redemption; for he that made us all, hath redeemed us all; and if we continue servants unto sin, we do not only violate that ancient or former bond which we owed unto him by right of creation, but that second bond, whereby we stand bound unto him by right of redemption. And transgressors we should be, and most unthankful wretches, if we did not cheerfully and sincerely betake ourselves unto his service, albeit the reward or recompense, which he hath promised and will perform, were but equal to the fruits or pleasures of sin.

But the truth is, that so far they are from all equality, that there is no proportion between them. The wages of sin are less than nothing compared to the reward of righteousness, which is more than all things else that can befall us. For not to be at all, never to have had any being, were better than to suffer the death here meant, so that death and life, especially everlasting death and everlasting life, cannot come into any balance. That which is worse than nothing, or not being, (so is everlasting death,) cannot be compared with any thing that is good, much less with the perfection of goodness, (such is everlasting life,) which containeth all goodness whereof we can imagine our nature to be capable.

The service of sin and righteousness compared in regard of this present life.

2. The only comparison then must be between the service of sin and the service of righteousness, in respect of our present estate, or during the time of this mortal life. And so (if you mark it) our apostle hath two motives to withdraw us from the service of sin, and two to draw us to the service of righteousness.

The first motive, to withdraw us from the service of sin, is, that it is fruitless and shameful for the present.

The first motive, again, to sway us unto the service of righteousness, is the present fruit which we have unto holiness; and between these two there may be some comparison, if we sequester them from the other two, to wit, from life and death everlasting.

To sequester the service of righteousness altogether from the hope of everlasting life, or the service of sin altogether from the fear of everlasting death, is a thing, if not impossible, yet not warrantable, as was shewed before in the tenth chapter: for those things which God hath conjoined, man may not sever; yet we may so far sever them, as God permitted them to be severed in the wiser heathen[s]. The very heathens felt a kind of compunction or sting of conscience upon the commission of grosser sins, which did suggest a kind of tacit fear, but of what evil to come they expressly knew not. They had again a kind of joy, or grateful testimony, or congratulation of spirit or conscience upon the practice of things honest and comely: and this joy did kindle a secret hope or encouragement to go forwards in those courses; but it burst not out into a flame, it wanted the light or guidance of divine truth. For both this fear and this hope they had without any express hope of everlasting life, or express fear of everlasting death. However, the wiser or more moderate

[s] See chapter 10.

sort of them did prefer the practice of virtue, or such piety as they knew, before the wonted pleasures of this life.

Yet this their greatest philosophers did not do, without 484
the contradiction of such as were given over to bodily pleasures. And this opposition of sensual men may seem to have some ground of reason, even from the rule of faith itself, if we had no more express hopes of everlasting life, or more distinct fear of everlasting death, than they had.

For shall we not think that the estate of Dives was much better than the estate of Lazarus in this life, wherein Dives received pleasure and Lazarus pain? Now pleasure is much better than pain; and if such a life as Dives here led afforded pleasure, how was it fruitless, specially in respect of Lazarus's life, which was full of pain? Indeed, in respect of a life so charged with pain as Lazarus's was, or with such vexations and dangers as the life of St. Paul and other more eminent saints of God in the primitive church were, that saying of our apostle is most true, 1 Cor. xv. 19: *If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.* His meaning is, That if bodily death might have put an unquestionable end to all the controversies betwixt him and his persecutors, there had been no gain, but loss rather, in the prolongation of his life. But when men truly professing the power of Christianity may be devout, be religious, be obedient without danger of persecution, the case is altered. So that our apostle's saying doth not concern the peaceable and prosperous estate of Christians, but the iniquity of those times, and of such times as those.

3. But we must consider that there is a great deal of difference between contradicting infidelity, or express denial of the soul's immortality, or the resurrection of

the body, and such an implicit or indistinct notion of some recompense for well-doing, and punishments for ill-doings, as the wiser heathens did acknowledge. Such of them as constantly acknowledged but thus much, though not without interposition of some doubting or distrusting fits concerning the soul's immortality, without any notion at all of the body's resurrection, did fully accord with our apostle in this place: That the service of sin, or (to speak in their language) a voluptuous life, was altogether fruitless. So the Roman orator tells us: *Omnis voluptas pro nihilo putanda est, quod cum præterierit perinde sit ac si nulla fuisset:* "All pleasure is to be accounted as nothing worth, because when it is once past, it is as if it had never been;" that is, it leaves no fruit behind it: it is at the best but as a blossom or bud which withers or falls away before the fruit be set: and a blossom without hope of fruit is altogether fruitless, and of no esteem. Thus he spake of *voluptas*, that is, of pleasure of the body; but he always maintained the contrary concerning *gaudium*, which we call the pleasure or joy of the mind, or the inward testimony of a good conscience. In this point, the same Roman orator (with Seneca and divers other heathen poets and philosophers) did accord as well with Solomon, as in the other sentence he did with St. Paul, to wit, "That a good conscience was a continual feast." See the tenth chapter of this book; and see Tully de Finib. lib. 2. and De Senectute; and his Paradoxes.

The emptiness and vanity of sinful pleasures.

4. But I know what a more dissolute heathen than Tully was, or a voluptuous Christian or carnal gospeller, would at this day object—that they are acquainted with greater bodily pleasures than the heathen philosophers or precise Christians have experience of; and for this reason will appeal from us as incom-

petent judges. And I confess it is true; a dissolute or voluptuous man, whether heathen or Christian, oft-times enjoys for a space some greater pleasures of the flesh than any civil or modest man can do. And this was the misery or ignorance of the best sort of heathens, (which did excuse them *a tanto*, though not 485
a toto, that is, in respect of us, not simply,) in that they did not know or suspect an invisible adversary, which deals with us as a cunning quacksalver or crafty mountebank; one that secretly corrupts our diet, and by degrees insensible brings many diseases upon us, that he may gain credit or esteem by giving us some present ease or pleasant remedy, though never any perfect cure. And yet the heathen philosopher had observed, that most of those pleasures of the body or flesh, by which men are specially drawn from the practice of virtue, or moral honesty, were usually apprehended to be much greater than they truly were; both because most men look upon their faces or approaches in coming towards them, not upon their departure or back parts at their going away: and because they are the remedies or present abatements of some grievous disease, which it were much better not to have, than to stand in need of any medicine how pleasant soever.

He that is cured of a deep wound or sore feels more ease or pleasure when it grows toward the healing, than he should have done in that part if it had continued whole. Yet who would long for a wound to find such ease and contentment?

He that is sick of a burning fever will take more pleasure, for the time being, in drinking a cup of cold water, than a man in perfect health would do in a draught of the pleasantest wine. Yet who would choose to be sick to enjoy such pleasure? There is

(I take it) no greater pleasure of any sense than cooling moisture in the extremity of thirst. But it is a greater misery to be put unto this need or exigence. So is it with all dissolute or voluptuous men. Take them for the present, as they are overgrown in dissoluteness and intemperancy, and it is a great pleasure for them to have their desires satisfied: but it is a kind of hell in the mean time to be pestered with such desires, which are always more permanent and more durable than their satisfactions or contentments can be. Besides, that the ease and remedies which for the present they find, do in the issue increase and malignify the nature of their disease.

And if they had been once acquainted with the true delight and pleasures of a moderate and sober life, they would loathe their desires, as much as a man that knows what health is, would dislike the momentany pleasures of the sick.

God's method and Satan's practice.

5. That commendation which the governor of the marriage feast of Cana in Galilee did give the bridegroom, in comparison of ordinary innkeepers or wine-drawers in his time, may serve to set forth the difference between the service of righteousness and the service of sin; or between the contrary method which our Lord and Master and the prince of this world observe in rewarding their followers: *Every man*, saith the governor of the feast, John ii. 10, *at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse:* this is the very picture or image of Satan's practice: *but thou* (saith the same governor of the feast unto the bridegroom) *hast kept the good wine until now;* that is, until the close of the feast. And this is the type or emblem of our Saviour's method.

To apply it more plainly. The devil still labours to

glut men in their best days with the sweetest pleasures or contentments of the body; and when he hath made them drunk, or brought upon them an unquenchable thirst or longing after the like, then he vents his snuffs or refuse upon them, and plies them until they drink the very dregs of God's wrath. But our Saviour keeps his best fruits unto the last, and by his first blessings doth but as it were prepare and qualify our corrupted nature to be every day than other more 486
capable of better. And as of Satan's malice and mischief, so of his mercy and goodness there is no end to such as embrace them, until they bring us to an endless and most blessed life.

Holiness bitter in the root or beginning, but sweet in the fruit.

The beginnings of sin are always pleasant, at least sin puts us to no pain in producing the habit or custom of it, because it is implanted in us by nature. But that which one wittily said of good arts or learning is most true of the service of righteousness: *Radices amaræ, fructus dulces.* The root or beginning of it is commonly unpleasant, because it cannot be ingrafted into our corrupted nature but as it were by incision; but the growth of it is pleasant, and the fruits, to such as are exercised therein, most sweet and wholesome.

This is in effect the very same that Siracides saith, (perhaps himself had experimented,) Ecclus. iv. 17, 18: *At the first wisdom will walk with a man by crooked ways, and bring fear and dread upon him, and torment him with her discipline, until she may trust his soul, and try him by her laws. Then will she return the straight way unto him, and comfort him, and shew him her secrets.*

For planting a firm resolution in us to endeavour the performance of those duties whereto our apostle in this place exhorts us, it is an excellent motive which

another heathen philosopher, Musonius[t], a Greek, as I take it, commended to his scholars, (and Cato urged the same to his soldiers at Numantia): "If," saith he, "you bestow your pains in the study of virtue and goodness, the pains will go away as fast as they come, but the virtue or goodness will abide with you: but if you take delight or pleasure in that which is evil, the pleasure will vanish, the evil will habituate itself, and incorporate itself in your nature, from which it may be more easily repelled than ejected after it hath taken possession."

Now to review honest pains or labours past is a thing grateful to our memory: a good fruit in itself of labours past, if they were not otherwise fruitful. But the regretting remembrance of time mispent in the pursuit of fruitless or unlawful pleasures is irksome, is tedious, is loathsome, even to corrupted nature. Thus far, and further, some of the heathens did run parallel with our apostle in this place. What manner of men then may we think these philosophers would have proved, as well in practice as speculation, if their speculations had been seasoned or balanced (as ours are) either with the certain hope of everlasting life, by perseverance in well-doing, or with fear of an everlasting death, for continuance in doing evil? And yet we say, that even the best works, the best endeavours and speculations of these heathens, were but *splendida peccata*, "more neat and handsome sins." God grant that most of our own works or speculations may prove much better!

6. Whilst I compare the industry of these heathen philosophers, in employing those poor talents which were bestowed upon them, with the sluggish and decrepit temper of this age, wherein the plentiful

[t] See A. Gellius, lib. 16. cap. 1.

revelation of divine truth, to them unknown, becomes but barren; methinks the epigrammatist's case might be a fit emblem for the world as it stood affected, whilst civility and good literature were but young, and as it is now disposed, whilst it hath all experience and helps of former ages. The tenor of the epigrammatist's complaint was thus:

Pauper eram juvenis, senio confectus inerti
Sum locuples; misere sorte in utraque miser.

'Whilst I was young, and able to enjoy the contentments which wealth affords, my fortunes were mean, and my estate but poor; but now wealth is fallen upon me when I have one foot in the grave, and know no use of it: so that in both ages, in both fortunes, I am a miserable man.'

But why the revelations of divine truth are so plen- 487
tiful in this dull, this old and sleepy age of the world, which will not make right use of them, when as they were so rare and scant in those times and nations which in all human probability would have used them much better—this is a depth or abyssus which may not be dived into. Only this we are bound to believe in general, that the only wise immortal God, *whose judgments are unsearchable, and his ways past finding out*, hath reasons in themselves most just, though known to himself alone, why he thus dispenseth his blessings; and such reasons as shall appear, not only most just, but most admirable unto us, when *we shall know as we are known*.

Our fruitlessness in holiness to be imputed only to our own ill use of the talent of grace given us.

7. If in the mean time our consciences tell us that we ourselves, or common report informs us that many of our brethren, fall short, not of our calling only, but even of those heathens, in the knowledge or practice of many moral duties required of both; let us not

make the final resolution of this defect into the eternal and irresistible decree, or into the want of means of grace for doing either better or less amiss than we do: for even those heathens, which had not half the ordinary means, nor any portion of these special gifts which we have received, did much better than most of us do. O say not, O think not, that even this want of grace, or neglect or ill employment of those talents which God hath given us, are to be imputed either to Adam's fall or our pollution in him. Adam's fall indeed was the only cause why we stood in need of grace or means extraordinary for our recovery; but neither his fall, nor any preterition of our persons or individuals which have fallen in him, are either the only or the principal cause why we are destitute of that measure of grace which is not, but should be in us, or of our present unbelief or misbelief.

The true cause of all these is, our non-employment or misemployment of our talent which we have received in baptism; or our abuse of that favour or mercy which God for his part in baptism sincerely hath plighted unto us.

But now that we have not only shamefully broke, but almost perpetually broken that vow which we made to God in baptism, are we in the same estate that Adam was? Or is this covenant no better than that which God made with him? Yes; he had no promise of being renewed by repentance if he should fall from his first estate. The first covenant being once broken was not to be renewed, but a second to come in its place; and into this covenant we entered by baptism. And though the sacrament of baptism, or the visible sign of it, may not be iterated; yet the astipulation or answer of a good conscience to God

may and ought to be renewed, and at no time more fitly or opportunely than at the receiving of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood.

One special use of this sacrament in the primitive church (in the times of persecution) was to resume or ratify the vow made in baptism, as appears by Pliny[u] the second, who had the Christians in Bithynia in examination upon the meaning or intent of this sacrament: for the very name of it was suspicious to the Roman state. And that very preparation which is required of all which mean to be partakers of the sacrament may be reduced to these three heads:

Three heads of preparation to the holy sacrament.

First, To arraign, accuse, and judge ourselves for our former frequent neglect of our vow in baptism.

Secondly, To request absolution and pardon of God; which no man humbly and seriously doth, but he solemnly promiseth amendment of what is past.

Thirdly, To implore the special aid or assistance of 488
God's Spirit for better performance of our vow and of what we now promise; and all this only for the merits of Christ, and through the efficacy of his body and blood. I will conclude with that of the psalmist—*Vovete, et vota reddite Jehovæ.*

CHAP. XX.

ROMANS VI. 21. 23.

For the end of those things is death.—For the wages of sin is death.

The first and second death both literally meant the wages of sin. *Both described, both compared, and shewed how and wherein the second death exceeds the first. The greater deprivation of good, the worse and more unwelcome death is. Every member of the body, every faculty of the soul,*

[u] Plin. Epist. lib. 10. ep. 97.

the seat and subject of the second death. A map and scale: the surface and solidity of the second death. Pain improved by enlarging the capacity of the patient, and by intending or advancing the activity of the agent. Three dimensions of the second death: 1. *intensiveness;* 2. *duration;* 3. *unintermitting continuation of torment.* Pœna damni et sensus, *terms coincident. Pains of the damned essential and accidental. Just to punish momentany sin with pain eternal. The reflection and revolution of thoughts upon the sinner's folly, the worm of conscience.*

1. DEATH and life have the same seat and subject. Nothing dieth unless it first live; and death in the general is an extinction of life. Death in scriptures is two ways taken.

First, For bodily death, which is *the first death.*

Secondly, For the death of both body and soul, which is called *the second death.*

Both are here literally meant; both are the wages of sin.

The former death is common to all, excepting such of the godly as shall be found alive at Christ's coming to judgment; they shall not die, but be changed.

Of bodily death, or the first death.

First then of bodily death; and secondly of supernatural, or the second death, and wherein it exceedeth the first death.

The opposition between bodily death and bodily life is merely privative; such as is between light and darkness, or between sight and blindness. And this death must be distinguished according to the degrees of life of which it is the privation.

Of life, the degrees be three: the first of mere vegetables, as of trees, of plants, of herbs, or whatsoever is capable of growth or nourishment; the second is of creatures endued with sense; the third is the life of man, who, besides sense, is endued with reason. The reasonable life includes the sensitive, as the sensitive

doth the life vegetable. Whatsoever bodily creature is endowed with reason, is likewise endowed with sense. But many things which are endowed with sense are uncapable of reason. And again, what creature soever it be which is partaker of the life sensitive, is partaker likewise of vegetation, of growth or nourishment. But many things which are nourished and grow, as trees, herbs, plants, grass, and corn, are uncapable of the life 489
sensitive; and yet even these are said to die, as they properly do when their nutriment fails. But albeit the first beginning of man's life in the womb be only vegetative, not sensible or reasonable, yet no man dieth according to this kind of death only; for such as fall into an atrophy, (which is a kind of death, or privation of the nutritive faculty,) yet are they not to be accounted as dead so long as they have the use of any sense, no, nor after they be deprived of all outward senses, so long as their hearts do move, or their lungs send out breath: so that the bodily death of man includes a privation of sense and motion. This difference again may be observed in the degrees of bodily death.

2. Trees and vegetables always die without pain; so do not man and beast; for that both of them are endowed with sense and motion, both of them are capable of pain; and pain, if it be continued and extreme, draws sensitive death after it. Nor can this death approach or find entrance into the seat of life but by pain. And inasmuch as this kind of life is sweet, death, which is the deprivation of it, is always unpleasant and terrible unto man, not only in respect of the pain which ushers it in, but in respect of the loss of vital sweetness which it brings with it. The pains of dying may be as great in beasts as in man;

so is not the loss of that goodness which is contained in life; for reasonless creatures perceive it not. A memory they have of pains past, a sense or feeling of pains present, and a fear of death when it approacheth, but no forethought or reckoning of what follows after death. This is proper to the reasonable creature. Now this forethought of what may follow after, makes death more bitter to man than it can be to reasonless creatures. And amongst men, the more or greater the contentments of life have been, and the better they are provided for the continual supply of such contentments, the more grievous is the conceit or forethought of death natural unto them. The summons of death is usually more unwelcome to a man in perfect health than to a crazed body; so it is to a man of wealth and credit, more than to one of a forlorn estate or broken fortunes. So saith Ecclesiasticus, chap. xli. 1: *O death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee to a man that liveth at rest in his possessions, unto the man that hath nothing to vex him, and that hath prosperity in all things: yea, unto him that is yet able to receive meat!*

Yet is not the loss of life, of sense, or the foregoing of worldly contentments, the only cause why men naturally fear death; for though it deprive them of all these, yet doth not the death of man consist in this deprivation. The body loseth all these by the divorce which death makes betwixt it and the soul; but seeing the substance of the soul still remains, the greatest fear which can possess a natural man is the future doubtful estate of the soul after this dissolution. Many which never hoped or expected any reunion or second marriage between the soul and body after death had once divorced them, had yet a true notion that the

soul did not die with the body; and out of this conceit some were more afraid of death than any brutish or reasonless creature can be.

Some other few became as desirous of it, as prisoners, which hope to escape, are of a gaol delivery; and thought it a great freedom (especially in their discontented melancholy passion) to have the keys of this mortal prison in their own keeping, to be able to let their souls and life out at their pleasure. But though it be universally true, that the corruptible body during the time of this life is but a walking prison, or moveable cage, unto the immortal soul; yet the soul being long accustomed to this prison doth naturally choose to continue in it still, rather than to be uncertain whither to repair after it go hence. Desire of death, or self homicide.

That some heathens have taken upon them to let 490
their souls out of their bodies before the time appointed by course of nature, or doom given upon them by their supreme Judge; this was but such a delusion of Satan, as one man sometimes in malice puts upon another: for so ofttimes a secret enemy or false friend hath persuaded others to break the prison whereto they were upon presumption rather than on evidence of any notorious fact committed, to make them by this means unquestionably liable unto the punishment of death, which without such an escape they might have escaped. For any man wittingly and willingly to separate the soul and body which God hath joined, is a damnable presumption, an usurpation of God's own office or authority.

To solicit or sue for a divorce betwixt them is not safe for any, save only for such as have good assurance, or probable hopes, that when they are dissolved they shall be with Christ. Now the souls of such as die in him have no desire to return unto the former

prison of the body. But such as have not in this life been espoused unto him would choose rather to remain in, or to return unto, their former prison, than to be held in custody by their spiritual enemies. Their estate for the present is worse than the sufferance of bodily death, being charged both with perpetual sufferance and expectation to suffer the second death.

Of the second death, wherein it exceeds the first.

3. And this death differs more from the first death than *inter numerandum;* that is, more than in order of account, or rank of place. What, then, is not the second death a privation of life? Yes; it is all this, and somewhat more besides. Every vice includes a privation of the contrary virtue, and is a great deal worse than want of virtue. So every sickness includes a privation of some branch of health, and is much worse than a neutrality, or middle temper, (if any such there be,) between health and sickness. So doth the second death include an extreme contrariety to life and all the contentments of it. Blindness is a mere privation of sight; and the eye which cannot see is dead in respect of this branch of life; and this death, or deprivation of this sense, is only matter of loss. The eye, or subject of sight, (ofttimes,) after the loss of sight, suffers no pain; no more doth the ear after it becomes deaf; nor the sense of feeling after it be numbed. A man stricken with the palsy feels no smart in that part which it possesseth. Whilst any part of our body is sensible of pain, it is an argument that it is yet alive, not quite dead; and yet is all pain rather a branch of death than of life. For much better it were to die the first death than to live continually in deadly pain. No man but would be willing to lose a tooth, rather than to have it perpetually tormented with the toothache. Now the second death is no other than a perpetual living unto deadly pain or torture.

Bodily death, or not being, is not so much worse than life natural with all its contentments, as the second death is worse than the first, or the bodily pains which can accompany it. The parts or branches of the first death are altogether as many as the parts of life natural; the seat or subject of the second death is larger. There is no member of the body, or faculty of the soul, whether sensitive or rational, which becomes not the seat or subject of the second death. As this death is *the wages of sin*, so it is for extension commensurable unto the body of sin. Now there is no part or faculty in man which in this life hath been free from sin; and whatsoever part or faculty hath in this life been polluted with sin, becomes the seat and dwellingplace of the second death. Wheresoever sin did enter, it did enter but as an harbinger to take up so many several rooms for that death. Who is he that can say that lust hath not sometimes entered in at the 491
eye? that the seeds of lust, of envy, of murder, and of other sins, have not taken possession of the ear? that his tongue or taste hath not given entertainment to riot, gluttony, and excess in meat and drink? that his sense of smell hath not been sometimes a pander to these and the like exorbitances? And the other fifth, or gross sense of touch, is as the common bed of sin; for it spreads itself throughout all the rest, and is the foundation of every other external sense.

4. To give you then a true map of the second death—and more than a map of it, or of their estate that are subject unto it, we cannot exhibit:—the map, with the true scale for measuring the region of death, with the miserable estate of its inhabitants, is thus:

Nature and common experience afford us these general unerring rules:

A double reason of the vehemency of pain or torment in the second death.

That all pain and grief are improved by one of these two means, or by both:

As, first, by enlarging the capacity of every sense or faculty which is capable of pain or discontent. Secondly, by the vehemency or violence of the object or agent which makes the impression upon the passive sense or capacity.

One and the same agent, as well for quality as for intention of its active force, doth not make the same impression upon different subjects, though both capable of impression; as one and the same flame and steam of fire hath not one and the same effect on iron, steel, and wax, though all of them be in the same distance from it. *Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis:* "How powerful soever any agent be, the patient can receive or retain no more of its power than it is capable of." Again; how capable soever the patient be of any violent impression, yet the capacity of it is not filled, unless the force of the agent be proportionable unto it. And though it be able to receive never so much, yet it is true again, *Nihil dat quod non habet, nec plus dat quam habet:* "No creature, no agent whatsoever, can bestow any greater measure, whether of good or evil, whether of pain or pleasure, than is contained within the sphere of its activity."

From these unquestionable principles this universal conclusion will undoubtedly follow: 'That all excess, or full measure of pain, of grief, or woe, of every branch of *malum pœnæ*, must amount from the improved capacity of the sense or faculty which receives impression, and from the strength and potency of the object which makes the impression.'

5. There is no human body which is not by nature

capable of the gout; yet such as are accustomed to coarser fare, to moderate diet, and hard labour, are less capable of this disease than such as cherish and pamper the sense of taste and touching. What is the reason? Daintiness of diet improves the capacity of the sense of feeling, and makes it more tender, and so more apt to receive the impression of noisome humours; and the same daintiness, or excess of delicate fare, is more apt and forcible to breed plenty of forcible and piercing humours than coarser fare or moderate diet is. For the same reason, he whose sense of smelling or taste is by natural disposition of body, or by accustomance, more subtile or accurate, will be more offended with loathsome smells and nasty food, than he which hath the same senses by a natural disposition more dull, or more disused from delicate odours or dainty meats. And a musical ear, accustomed to melodious consorts, will be more displeased with jarring or discording sounds, than he which hath the same sense of hearing unpolished by art, or accustomed to ruder noises. The more accu- 492
rate a man's sight is by natural disposition, or the more insight a man hath in the art of limning or painting, or the more accustomed he is to view fresh colours and proportions, the more impatient he is to behold unsightly objects or deformed prospects. And according to the increase of unsightliness or ugliness in the object, his offence or grief doth still grow and increase. The rule then is general, that the discontent, the grief or pain of every one of the five outward senses, still accrues from the capacity or aptitude of the sense to receive ingrateful impressions, and from the potency or efficacy of the agent to make such impressions.

The same rule holds as true in our internal faculties

or senses. A man by natural disposition of immoderate appetite for meat and drink is far more tormented with the same want of them than a moderate or less greedy appetite is. And this sense, which is none of the five, hath this peculiar property, that it is tormented with its own capacity, without any agent or object to inflict pain upon it. The mere want of food is more grievous to it than any positive pain that can befall it by any external agents.

To a man, again, of a curious fancy or accurate judgment, an ignorant or slovenly discourse is more unpleasant than to an illiterate man, or to one of duller capacity for wit.

To an ambitious or popular man, the least touch of disesteem, or jealousy of disrespect, is more bitter than an open affront or disgrace unto an honest, upright heart, which looks no way but one, to that which leads to truth and honesty. And he that labours to improve this appetite of honour or popular esteem, doth but solicit the multiplication of his own woes: for seeing *honor est in honorante*, honour is seated in them that do the honour, not in them that are honoured, seeing popular applause depends upon the breath of the multitude, the man that sets his mind upon it doth but as one that exposeth his naked body to the lash or scourge, or at the best to others' courtesy. A man that much mindeth his gain, and hath his senses exercised in cunning bargainings, takes the loss of opportunity or fair advantage to increase his wealth more deeply to heart than another man, whose mind is weaned from the world, doth his very want or penury. So that though the want or loss of the one be much greater than the other's, yet the capacity of his appetite, or desire of gain, is much less, and therefore no way so apt to receive the impression of

discontentment or grief from the same occurrences or occasions which torment the other.

6. Now to put all these together:—Let us suppose one and the same man to be immoderately desirous of worldly honours and riches, and, by this means, of an extraordinary capacity for receiving all those parts of grief or sorrow which can accrue from loss of goods, from contempt, disgrace, and scorn; and yet withal as capable of, and as much inclined to, all the pleasures of bodily senses, whereby his capacity of pain or torture may be improved to the uttermost. Let us also suppose or imagine the same man to be daily exposed to all the temptations, to all the vexations that his bodily senses or internal faculties are capable of, from the occurrences or impressions of objects most ingrateful; as, to be daily cheated, daily disgraced; to have his eyes filled with ghastly sights, his ears with hideous noises, his smell cloyed with loathsome savours, and his taste vexed with bitter and unpleasant meats, or rather poison, which cannot be digested; and his sense of touch daily infested with deadly pain; his appetite of meat and drink daily tormented with hunger and thirst—and from a man in this woful estate and piteous plight we may take the surface or first dimen- 493
sion of the second death, but not the thickness or solidity of it.

That we must gather thus: first by negatives. How capable soever a man's bodily senses may be of pain or pleasure, or his internal faculties of joy or sorrow; yet it is generally true in this life, *Vehemens sensibile corrumpit sensum:* "The vehemency or excessive strength of the agent or sensible object doth corrupt or dead the sense." Huge noises, though in their nature not hideous, or for quality not displeasing, will breed a deafness in the ear. And though light be the

most grateful object that the eye can behold, yet the too much gazing upon it, or the admission of too much of it into the eye, will strike it with blindness. Long accustomance unto dainty meats doth dull the taste and take away the appetite. Likewise, too much cold or too much heat doth either dissolve or benumb the sense of feeling; and a man may lose, not the smelling only, but even the common sense, or animal faculty, by strong perfumes, much more by loathsome and abominable smells. There is not one of the five outward senses, but if its proper object be too violent, or too vehement, may let in death to all the rest. A man may be killed without a wound, either at the eye or at the ear, at the nose or at the mouth: so he may be by the sense of hunger or thirst, without any weapon or poison, only by mere want of food. The gangrene (or other like disease, which works only upon the sense of touch or feeling) brings many to an end without any foreign enemy. Some have died a miserable death by close imprisonment in a nasty prison, without violence to any other sense save only to the sense of smelling. Many have died of surfeits, though of delicate, and, in their kind, wholesome meats. Regulus, that famous Roman senator, did die as miserable a death as his enemies could devise against him, without any other instrument of cruelty besides the force or strength of the most grateful object which the eye can behold, that is, of the sun; unto whose splendent beams his eyes were exposed without the mask or shelter of his eyelids, which his cruel enemies (for increasing his pain and lingering torture) had cut off.

Others again, which wanted no contentment either of the outward or internal senses, have died through mere grief and sorrow, first conceived either from loss

of goods or friends, or for fear of disgrace and shame; and some through excessive and sudden joy. So that in this life it is universally true, and undoubtedly experienced in all the bodily senses, and most other faculties of the soul, *Nullum violentum est perpetuum.* There is no grief, no pain or sorrow, whether inflicted by external agents, or whether it breeds within us, or be hatched by the reflection of our own thoughts upon others' wrongs, or our own oversights or misdeeds, but, if it be violent or excessive, it becomes like a raging flame, which both devours the subject whereon it exerciseth its efficacy, and puts an end to its own being, by destroying that fuel which fed it.

The duration or eternity of the second death, and pains of it.

7. This then is the property of the second death, and the miserable condition of such as must receive *the wages of sin;* that after the resurrection of the body, the capacities as well of the bodily senses as of other faculties, are so far improved, so far enlarged, that no extremity of any external agent, no virulency of any disease which breeds within them, no strength of imagination or reflection upon what they have in time past foolishly done, or what they suffer for the present, or may justly fear hereafter, can either dissolve or weaken their passive capacities or strength to endure the like. Every faculty becomes more durable than an anvil to receive all the blows that can be fastened upon them, and all the impressions, how violent soever, which in this life would in an instant dissolve or 494
dead them. So that the second death, as is said before, is a life or vivacity continually to sustain deadly pains.

The dimensions of this death may be deduced to these three heads:

First, to the intensiveness of the pain or grief, which is more extreme than any man in this life can

suffer, because the capacities of every sense, or passive faculty, are in a manner infinitely enlarged; and so is the strength or violence of external agents, and the sting of conscience, or perplexed thoughts, wonderfully increased.

Secondly, to the duration of all those punishments; for it is a death everlasting.

Lastly, to the uncessant perpetuity of these everlasting pains; for they are not inflicted by fits, but without all intermission, though but for a moment. There is not an ill day and a good, not an ill hour and a good, not an ill minute and a good, not an ill moment and a good, in hell; all times are extremely evil; variety of torments breeds no ease. Thus much appeared by the parable of the rich glutton, who could not obtain so much of Abraham as a drop of water to cool his tongue; which, if it had been granted, could not have effected any intermission or intercision of pain, nor any abatement, for the present, which would not have enraged the flame as much in the next moment. So that such as suffer the second death know not how to ask any thing for their good, because indeed nothing can do them any good; but all things, even their own wishes, conspire unto their harm, and increase their woe and misery.

8. Some, taking occasion from this parable, have moved a question, not much necessary, whether the fire of hell be material fire or no; that is, such as may palpably or visibly scorch the body, and torment the outward senses. Sometimes this fire is described by a flame, as in the parable of the rich glutton; sometimes by the blackness of darkness, as in St. Jude. It is not the flame or visibility of this fire which argues it to be material; the flame is least material in our fire. And palpable it may be, though not visible; but with this

question I will not meddle, being impossible to be determined without sight or experience, which God grant we never have. It shall suffice therefore in brief to shew how this fire, or rather the pains of the second death, are deciphered or displayed in scripture.

Now, as the joys of heaven are set forth unto us under such emblems or representations as are visible or known unto us, and yet we do not believe that they are formally or properly such as these shadows or pictures represent, but rather eminently contain the greatest joys that by these representations we can conceive or imagine; so we are bound to believe[x] that the pains of hell are at least either properly and formally such as the scripture describes them to be, or more extreme and violent than if they were such as the characters which the Holy Ghost hath put upon them do without metaphor import or signify. More extreme they are than flesh and blood in this life could endure for a minute; for as *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven*, so neither can they endure or inherit the kingdom of Satan: there must be a change of this corruptible nature before it be capable of these everlasting pains. So much the description of it in holy scripture doth import.

The first, and that a terrible description of it, is Isaiah xxx. 33: *Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared:—the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it.* The like, but more terrible, hath St. John, Rev. xx. 10: *The devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the false prophet are,* 495 *and shall be tormented day and night for ever and*

[x] See M. Mede on Prov. xxi. 16. Of the valley of Rephaim.

ever: and, as he adds, ver. 14, *this lake of fire is the second death.* And St. Jude tells us, that *the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, is set forth as an example or type of this eternal fire;* that is, such fearful torments as that people suffered for a moment, the damned shall suffer in hell eternally. The ruins of Sodom and Gomorrah, and the dead sea, or brimstone lake, wherein neither fish nor other creature liveth, was left unto all future ages, to serve as a map or picture of that lake of fire and brimstone which St. John mentions, that is, of hell. Now the very steam of such a lake would stifle or torment flesh and blood to death in a moment; the outward senses are not capable of its first impressions.

9. Some schoolmen have moved a more pertinent question, whether this punishment of sense (which—or the instrumental mean of which—is thus described unto us by a lake of fire and brimstone) be greater or less than the *pœna damni;* that is, whether their imprisonment or confinement to hell, and their subjection to tormenting fiends, be worse than their exclusion out of heaven, and the perpetual loss of God's joyful presence. The most resolve, that *pœna damni*, the loss of God's presence, is of the two the worse. And certain it is that it cannot be less, seeing that everlasting life, which is the gift of God, and crown of holiness, is at the least so much better, as the second death or pains of hell are worse than this mortal life.

Pœna damni et sensus terms subordinate.

But, if I mistake not, the members of this distinction concerning the punishment of loss, and the punishment of sense by pain, are not altogether opposite, but coincident; the very conceit or remembrance of this infinite loss, and of their folly in procuring it, cannot but breed an insufferable measure of grief and sorrow unto the damned, which will be fully equivalent to all

their bodily pain. And this fretting remembrance, and perpetual reflection upon the folly of their former ways, is, as I take it, that worm of conscience that never dies. But of this hereafter.

The miserable estate of the damned, or such as shall suffer the second death, may be reduced to these two heads: to punishment essential, or to punishment accidental or concomitant. The essential punishment comprehends both *pœna damni* and *pœna sensus:* the positive pains of that brimstone lake, and the worm of conscience which gnaweth upon their souls. The punishment accidental or concomitant is that loathsomeness of the region or place wherein they are tormented, and of their companions in these torments.

In this life that saying is generally true:

Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.

It is always some comfort to have consorts in our pain or distress. But this saying is out of date in the region of death; the more there be that suffer these pains, the less comfort there is to every one in particular: for there is no concord or consort, but perpetual discord, which is always so much greater by how much the parties discording are more in number: and to live in continual discord, though with but some few, is a kind of hell on earth. And thus much in brief of the second death, wherein it exceeds the first.

10. If any one that shall read this should but suspect or fear that God had inevitably ordained him unto this death, or created him to no better end than to the day of wrath, this very cogitation could not but much abate his love towards God, whom no man can truly love, unless he be first persuaded that God is good and loving, not towards his elect only, but to- 496
ward all men, towards himself in particular. But this opinion of absolute reprobation, or ordination to the

day of wrath, I pray may never enter into any man's brains.

But flesh and blood, though not polluted with this opinion, will, if not repine and murmur, yet perhaps demur a while upon another point more questionable, to wit, How it may stand with the justice of the most righteous Judge to recompense the pleasures of sin in this life, which is but short, with such exquisite and everlasting torments in the life to come; specially seeing the pleasures of sin are but transient, neither enjoyed nor pursued but by interposed fits, whereas the torments of that lake are uncessantly perpetual, and admit no intermission.

The usual answer to this query is, that every sin deserves a punishment infinite, as being committed against an infinite Majesty. But seeing this answer hath no ground or warrant from the rule of faith, in which neither the maxim itself is expressly contained, nor can it be deduced thence by any good consequence, we may examine it by the rule of reason. Now by the rule of reason and proportion, the punishment due to offences as committed against an infinite Majesty, should not be punishment infinite for time and duration, but infinite for quality or extremity of pain whiles it continues. If every minute of sinful pleasures in this world should be recompensed with a thousand years of hell pains, this might seem rigorous and harsh to be conceived of Him that is as infinite in goodness as in greatness, as full of mercy as of majesty. But whatsoever our thoughts or ways be, his ways, we know, are equal and just; most equal, not in themselves only, but even unto such as in sobriety of spirit consider them.

But wherein doth the equality of his ways or justice appear, when he recompenseth the momentany

pleasures of sin with such unspeakable everlasting torments? It appears in this: That he sentenceth no creatures unto such endless pains, but only such as he had first ordained unto an endless life; so much better at least than this bodily and mortal life, as the second death is worse than it. Adam had an immortal life (as a pledge or earnest of an eternal life) in possession; and had not lost it, either for himself or us, if he had not wilfully declined unto the ways of death, of which the righteous Judge had forewarned him. Now when life and death are so set before us, as that hold is given us of life, to recompense the wilful choice of death with death itself, this is most equal and just[y]. And if the righteous Lord had sentenced our first parents unto the second death immediately upon their first transgression, his sentence had been but just and equal; their destruction had been from themselves. Yet as all this had been no more than just, so it had been less than justice moderated, or rather overruled, by mercy. Now instead of executing justice upon our first parents, the righteous Lord did immediately promise a gracious redemption; and as one of the ancients said, *Felix peccatum quod talem meruit Redemptorem*; "It was a happy sin which gave occasion of the promise of such a Redeemer."

11. But did this extraordinary mercy promised to Adam extend itself to all? or to Adam only? or to some few that should proceed from him? Our public liturgy, our articles of religion, and other acts of our church, extend it to Adam and to all that came after him[z]. But how the nations whom God as yet hath not called unto the light of his gospel, or whose foreelders

[y] See above, chap. 4. §. 15. p. 70; and Attributes, parts 1 and 2. [vol. 5. of this edition.]

[z] See above, chap. 4. §. 12. p. 64.

he did not call unto the knowledge of his laws given unto Israel; how either fathers or children came to forsake the mercies wherein the whole human nature
407 in our first parents was interested, is a secret known to God, and not fit to be disputed in particular. This we are sure of in the general, that God did not forsake them till they had forsaken their own mercies. But for ourselves, all of us have been by baptism reordained unto a better estate than Adam lost: now if, upon our first, second, third, or fourth open breach or wilful contempt of our vow in baptism, the Lord had sentenced us unto everlasting death, or given Satan a commission or warrant to pay us the wages of sin, this had been but just and right; his ways in this had been equal, because our ways were so unequal. But now he hath so long time spared us, and given us so large a time of repentance, seeking to win us unto his love by many blessings and favours bestowed upon us: this (as the apostle speaks) is the riches of his bounty; certainly exceeding great mercy, much greater than justice; even mercy triumphing against judgment. Now if after all this we shall continue to provoke him, and defer our repentance, *turning his grace into wantonness*, making the plentifulness of his word the nurse and fuel of schism and faction, no judgment can be too great, no pain too grievous, either for quality or for continuance.

Possibility of repentance.

12. The doctrine of such catechists as would persuade or occasion men to suspect that God hath not yet mercy in store, or that there is no possibility for all that hear the word to repent, to believe, and be saved; whatsoever it do to the authors and followers of it in this life, it shall in the life to come appear even to such as perish to have been erroneous. For one special branch of their punishment, and that

wherein the punishment of such as hear the word and repent not doth specially exceed the punishment of the heathen or infidels, shall be their continual cogitation, how possible it was for them to have repented: how possible for them, how much more possible for them, than for infidels, to have been saved. The bodily pains of hell fire shall be (as is probable) equal to all; but the worm of conscience, which is no other than the reflection of their thoughts upon their madness in following the pleasures of sin, and neglecting the promises of grace, shall be more grievous to impenitent Christians. Worm of conscience.

A true scale or scantling of these torments we may take from the consideration how apt we are to grieve at our extraordinary folly or wretchlessness in this life, whether that have turned to the prejudice of our temporal estate, of our health, or bodily life, of our credit, or good name. There is not a man on earth but, if he would enter into his own heart, might find that he had many times committed greater folly than Esau did when he sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. He set his birthright (that is, his interest in the land of Canaan) on sale without the hazard of that inheritance which God had elsewhere provided for him; for he became lord of mount Seir. He did not contract for his own imprisonment or captivity: but we daily set heaven to sale, and hazard our everlasting exclusion from God's presence, for toys less worth, at least less necessary for us, than bodily meat was for Esau in his hunger. And yet by such foolish bargains we enter a covenant with death, and contract (though not expressly, yet implicitly) for an everlasting inheritance in hell. Now unto such as thus live and die without repentance, the most cruel torments that can be imagined cannot be so grievous as the continual cogitation

how they did bind themselves (without any necessity laid upon them) to receive the wages of sin, by receiving such base earnest as in this life was given them.

13. A more exact scale of the reward for this their folly we have in two fictions of the heathen: the one is that of Sisyphus his uncessant labour in rolling a huge stone, which still turns upon him with greater
498 force: the other is of Prometheus, whose liver (as they imagined) was continually gnawn upon by a vulture, or cormorant, without wasting the substance of it, or deading its capacity of pain. The continual reflection of such as perish upon their former folly, is as the rolling of Sisyphus's stone, a grievous labour, a perpetual torment, still resumed by them, but still more and more in vain; for no sorrow bringeth forth repentance there. And every such reflection or revolution of their thoughts upon their former ways is the gnawing of the worm of conscience, more grievous by much unto their souls than if a vulture should so continually gnaw their hearts.

CHAP. XXI.

ROMANS VI. 22, 23.

But now ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life.—The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Eternal life compared with this present life: the several tenures of both. The method proposed. The instability of this present life. The contentments of it short; and the capacities of man to enjoy such contentments as this life affords, narrower. In the life to come the capacity of every faculty shall be enlarged. Some senses shall receive their former contentments only eminenter; *as if one should receive the weight in gold for dross: some,* formaliter. *Joy essential and joy accidental.*

1. THE point remaining is, that this eternal life,

which is the crown of holiness, is so much better than this present life and its best contentments, as the second death is worse than this present life, however taken, at the best or worst. Now both sorts of life and death may be compared, either in respect of their proper quality, or of their duration. That, in respect of duration or continuance, this good and happy life, which is the crown of holiness, and that miserable death, which is the wages of sin, are equal, no Christian may deny, may suspect; for both are endless. That this life was endless, that such as are once possessed of it shall never be dispossessed of it, even Origen and his followers did never question; who notwithstanding did deny that this death, which was opposed unto it, was absolutely endless, though in scripture often said to be everlasting: for that, in their interpretation, was no more than to be of exceeding long continuance. But this heresy hath been long buried in the church, and his sin be upon him that shall seek to revive it.

The method then which we mean to observe is this:

First, to set forth the excellency of everlasting life in respect of this life present.

Secondly, to unfold the reasons, why neither the hope of everlasting life, nor the fear of an endless miserable death, do sway so much with most Christians, as in reason they ought, either for deterring them from the fruitless service of sin, or for encouraging them to proceed in holy and godly courses, whose end is everlasting life. In this latter we shall take occasion to unfold the fallacies or sophisms which Satan in his temptations puts upon us, with some brief rules or directions how to avoid them. A work questionless of much use and fruit, though handled by

few either so seriously or so largely as the matter requires.

499 In comparing this life with the life to come, we are in the first place to set forth the different tenures of them; secondly, to compare the several joys or contentments.

2. This present life, even at the best, is in comparison but a kind of death; for, as the heathen philosopher had observed, it is always *in fluxu*, like a stream or current, it runs as fast from us as it comes unto us. That part of our life which is past (saith Seneca) is, as it were, resigned up to death; that part which is yet to come, is not yet ours, nor can we make any sure reckoning of it. That part which we account as present is equally divided between death and us; not unconsonantly to that of David, psalm ciii. 15: *The days of man are but as grass: he flourisheth as a flower of the field. As soon as the wind goeth over it, it is gone*, &c. Or to that of Job, chap. xiv. 1, 2: *Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble. He cometh forth like a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth also as a shadow, and continueth not.* The addition or comment upon this in our liturgy is, *that in the midst of life we be in death;* that is, we die as fast as we live. The first part of our life is the beginning of our death; and death itself differs from life but as the point doth from the line which it terminates, or as the line doth from the surface, or the surface from the body whose surface it is. *Mors ultima linea rerum est.* The whole course of our life is full of interpunctions or commas; death is but the period or full point.

Take it at the very best, it is in respect of true life, or steadfast being, but as the reflex or image of a star in a flowing stream. The seat or subject of life doth

not continue the same it was, no, not for a moment; it is but one by continuation, or fresh supply of the like; as an army is said to be the same which consists of the like number of men, though most of the commanders and soldiers of the first levy be slain. So Darius the Persian had a legion which they called *immortal*, because it was continually supplied with the like number of new soldiers when the old ones failed[a]. For the same reason, some have compared the life of man unto a lamp, which burneth so long as it hath supply of oil, but is presently extinguished when the oil doth fail. And indeed, as the oil and light are to the lamp, wherein the one is contained, the other shineth; so is the natural heat and moisture unto the soul, especially as to life sensitive. But *when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption*, our souls shall then be in our glorified bodies, as light is in the stars, in their proper sphere. Our life shall be one and the same, not by continuation or succession of bodily parts. So as this first life, and that other life which we expect, differ, for their tenure and manner, as the representation or figure of the sun in the water and the sun in its sphere. The tenure of the one is fluent and transitory; the tenure of the other is solid and permanent. And proportionable to this difference of their tenures or durations are the different joys or contentments. If all the possible contentments in this life (suppose they were far more in number than they are) were put together, they could not equalize the contentments of one minute in the life to come.

The unsatisfaction of our desires in the contentments of this present life.

3. Our desires in this life are vast, and our capacities to enjoy the good of what we desire but narrow and slender. They consort no better than a decrepit

[a] Cœl. Rodigin. lib. 8. cap. 2. and lib. 25. cap. 1.

glutton's eye or appetite with his digestive faculty. Now it is a misery to have vast or strong desires, and not to be able to give them satisfaction; most miserable to take those courses which exclude them from possibility of satisfaction. Hence an heathen philosopher took the want or emptiness of this misery to be the complete sphere of true happiness; and out of this conceit defined a happy man briefly this; *Beatus est qui vivit ut vult:* "He is happy or blessed which hath all the contentments that he desires or wishes[b]." But St. Austin tells us that another heathen (whom he names not, but whose saying he often applauds) corrected this definition thus; *Beatus est qui vivit ut vult, modo nihil velit quod non debet:* "He is a happy man that hath all that he desireth, so he desire nothing but what he ought to desire." And certain it is that the former definition, without this correction, comes far short of that true happiness which is contained in everlasting life, or which all men by nature confusedly desire. For a man in this life may have every thing which in this life his heart desires, and yet not have his heart's desire. This no man can have in this life; nor doth the mere natural man find the way or entrance to it[c].

The heart's desire is true happiness.

Solomon had tried as great variety of particular contentments as any man living can project unto himself; and yet, after long experience of every particular that he could propose unto himself, gives up this general verdict; *Vanity of vanities; all is vanity and vexation of mind.* Yet is this vanity seated in the unsettled and fluctuant desires of man, not in the things themselves which he desires; for these have their right use, so they be referred to their proper

[b] See book 10. chap. 17. [vol. ix. p. 95.]

[c] See Christ's Answer to John's Disciples, [vol. vi. p. 301, &c.]

end, which is no other than true happiness: and no man can have his heart's desire until his heart do pitch and settle on this as its centre.

Hence some would define true happiness to be *plenitudo desideriorum*, "the full satisfaction of our desires." This all seek after without cessation; and some print, some scent or relish of it, we find in most desires of it. Somewhat there is in the right use of every creature which would lead us the right way unto it, did we not run counter, striving to make up a full measure of joy by the abundant fruition of these materials wherein we delight. Whereas the delight and contentment which we find in any creatures should turn our thoughts from them unto the inexhaustible fountain whence all the goodness that we find in them or in ourselves is derived. The nearer we draw to him, the nearer we are to true happiness: truly happy we cannot be until we enjoy his presence. *Irrequietum est cor nostrum ad te Domine, donec quiescat in te:* "Our hearts are restless in the pursuit of happiness, until they rest in thee, O Lord."

4. The first step to happiness which we can make, is, to be persuaded that true happiness cannot be obtained in this life. Our senses are uncapable of the accidental joys or concomitant glory which attend this happiness. And our reasonable soul, how magnificently soever philosophers speak of its nature, is more uncapable of essential joy and happiness; that consists in the fruition or enjoyment of the divine nature, which is happiness itself.

All the contentments of this life will serve to no other use than to be as a foil to set forth the happiness of the life to come. All the contentments possible of this life are entertained either by our bodily senses, or by the internal faculties of our souls. Now by the

discovery of the imperfections of such contentments, we may ascend by degrees to some competent scale or view for discovering the perfection of joys in the life to come.

The imperfection of all contentments incident to this life discovers itself these two ways:

First, The several capacities are too narrow and feeble in themselves to give entertainment to any portion of sincere and true joy: the very best contentments which here they find in any object are mingled with dregs.

501 Secondly, The satisfying of one capacity defrauds another of that measure of contentment whereof in this life it was otherways capable. And commonly the satisfying of the baser faculty, or meanest capacity, doth deprive the more noble faculty of its due. Men given to their bellies, or solicitous in purveying for the grosser senses of taste or touch, defraud the sense of sight, which is the gate of knowledge, and the ear, which is the sense of discipline, of their best contentments; for, as the old saying is, *Venter non habet aures*, "The belly hath no ears." And too much insight in the means which procure bodily pleasures doth blind or darken the common sense. Others, not so solicitous to feed the belly with meat as the ear with pleasant sounds, or the eye with delightful spectacles, do by both means rob the reasonable soul of her best solace, and as it were block up these ports and havens by which provision should come into her.

Every handicraft or art of husbandry requires an ordinary capacity, not of the common sense only, but of the understanding. And yet such as have their minds exercised in these and the like employments, are thereby disenabled for bearing rule or government over more civil and ingenuous men; as may be

collected from the wise Son of Sirach, Ecclus. xxxviii. 25—33. Even amongst the capacities or faculties of the reasonable soul there is not that harmony or concord which were requisite for her better contentment. Some men, in a manner freed from the servitude of their outward senses, and able to command their service for contemplation, by too much contemplating upon one sort of objects, make themselves uncapable of reaping that delight which other objects would more plentifully afford to these contemplators. Some, by studying the mathematics too much, do benumb their apprehensive faculties or capacities of prudence or civil knowledge. Others, whiles they seek to give too much satisfaction to their desires or capacities of civil wisdom or human prudence, do enfeeble their capacities, and starve their desires of divine mysteries or spiritual understanding.

Quite contrary it is in the life to come.

The full satisfaction of all senses and faculties in the life to come.

First, The capacity of every sense or faculty is improved to the uttermost; and no object shall intrude or offer itself, but such as are able to give severally full contentment without satiety.

Secondly, The harmony or consent between the several capacities and desires of every sense and faculty is most exact; the satisfying of one doth no way prejudice, but rather further another. Every one is apt to bear its part for making up of that full harmony which is required to true happiness.

And for those grosser senses of touch and taste, with the appetite of meat and drink; all the pleasures in this life, wherewith they are commonly overtaken, are (as we said before) medicines of diseases, rather than any true contentments.

The first degree or step to happiness is, to be freed from those diseases wherewith they now are pestered.

For though it be a misery for a man to want food when he is an hungry, or drink when he is thirsty, or raiment when he is cold, or needs it for ornament; yet we all conceive it to be a far greater happiness to enjoy continual health and liveliness without either hunger or thirst, or to have perfect comeliness without clothing or raiment. And for this reason that branch of happiness, which consists in satisfying the capacities of these senses, is in scripture described by negatives; as, there shall be no hunger there, no thirst, no grief, no pain. These are the symptoms of those grosser
502 senses in this life, which in the life to come shall not enjoy the pleasures or contentments which are contrary to these annoyances (as we say) in kind, but by a happy exchange: by such an exchange, as he that turns lead into silver doth forego a great deal of dross or baser metal, but gains that which contains the full value of it in a small weight or compass.

Of all and every one of the bodily contentments we can possibly imagine, the very immortality of glorified bodies is for quality more than the quintessence or extraction. It containeth health and cheerfulness of spirit, with all the pleasures that accompany them, (as we say,) *eminenter;* that is, as one pound weight of gold fully contains in its worth many hundreds of lead; so one moment of immortality, the least weight of glory we can imagine, is worth a full age of all the health and happiness that can be had on earth. Instead of material food, which perisheth with the use, and whose fulness doth always breed satiety, the appetite of meat and drink shall be continually satisfied with *the tree of life*, which (or rather the emblem or type of which) our first parents were not admitted to touch in paradise.

6. When the Sadducees captiously demanded which

of those seven brethren should have that woman to his wife in the world to come which had been successively married to all the seven, our Saviour answers; *The children of this world marry, and are given in marriage: but they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels.* What, then, shall such as have enjoyed the comfort of wedlock be utterly deprived of that comfort in heaven which was allotted to Adam in paradise, even in the state of innocency? They shall not have it in kind; for seeing *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven*, there shall not be there any *two in one flesh:* but in lieu of this comfort, such as observe the commandments of Christ shall be more nearly espoused and joined in spirit unto Christ: for as man and wife make one body, so *he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit*, 1 Cor. vi. 17. This is the consummation of that great mystery which is here begun on earth, and whereof the first marriage in paradise was but the visible sign or shadow; this is the very perfection of all pure and chaste love.

As for those other purer senses of sight and hearing, they shall enjoy their former contentments, both *eminenter* and *formaliter*, both in kind and by happy exchange. Though enabled they shall be to see far more glorious sights, and to hear more heavenly sounds, than in this life they could either hear or see; yet shall they not be disenabled to see the same sights, or hear the same sounds, which sometimes in this life they did. But these they shall hear and see with infinite more delight and joy, because the capacity of these senses shall be improved as far as life itself is improved, which of mortal becomes immortal.

The light was truly heavenly which did shine about St. Paul, and the voice was heavenly which spake unto him as he was journeying towards Damascus; but the light did strike him blind, and the voice astonished him. What was the reason? Being yet in the flesh, his senses were not capable of these celestial impressions.

But this, you will say, was a judgment upon St. Paul, because he was yet a persecutor: so was not St. Peter when he saw our Saviour's transfiguration upon the mount. This was but a glimpse of that glory which shall be revealed; and yet it so overcharged his senses that it put him in a manner besides himself, besides his wit or understanding: for he knew
503 not what he said, when he said, *Let us make here three tabernacles; one for thee, and one for Moses, and another for Elias.* Only this he was sure of in the general, *that it was good being there;* or that if he should always have been, as for the present he was, he should have been a most happy man; specially if his capacity to receive or entertain what he then heard or saw had been any way proportionable unto them. St. Paul likewise, after his conversion, was so rapt in spirit with the celestial words which he heard, that it seemed he knew not whether *he were in the body or out of the body* when he heard them; that is, whether he were locally present in paradise, whence those words were spoken, or whether his spirit were elevated to hear them in such distance; whether of the two it was, certainly such words they were that they could not be uttered by him, or be made known unto others, 2 Cor. xii. 4. And as the words were unutterable, so the joys which then possessed him were unexpressible by any known similitude or resemblance. O how great then shall those joys be,

when the sense of hearing shall be as capable of these celestial voices as it now is of earthly; when our sense of sight shall be as fitly proportioned to the spectacles of paradise as it is now unto the stars of the firmament; when all our faculties shall be as capable of celestial influences as they are now of sublunary impressions?

7. Briefly, all the joys or contentments of the life to come, even complete happiness itself, may be reduced to these two: first, to joy or happiness essential; secondly, to joy or happiness concomitant or accidental. Of both in their order, and how they are set forth unto us in scripture. Joy or happiness essential consists in the fruition of God's presence.

But seeing the Deity or divine nature is every where present, is it not now present with us on earth? sure it is; but we are far from it. A light or candle may be present to a blind man, and yet he as far from enjoying any comfort of its presence, as if it were put under a bushel at the antipodes. Such is the case of all whose sins have made a separation betwixt their God and them; he is present with them, present in them, but they are further removed from the comfort of his presence than the centre of the earth is from the highest heavens. The three children were in the fiery furnace, but it made no impression upon them, they felt no smart or pain from it, because the heat of it did not enter into them. Thus the Divine Nature or Essence doth encompass all, good and bad, more truly than the furnace did their bodies; yet he that could withdraw the force or influence of heat from the fire, can likewise withhold the joy or comfort of his presence from such as love him not. But wheresoever it is, it is the fountain of all joy and happiness: and shall any man be in the foun-

tain of joy and happiness, and shall this fountain be in them, and they not made happy by it? Yes; it is not enough that the fountain of happiness is in them, they must enter into the joy of this fountain, before they become happy by it. Now that servant which hath once entered into his master's joy, needs no other external contentment or object to satisfy the particular capacities of sense, or of any internal faculties. For as the being of every creature is contained in the omnipotent nature, in a more excellent manner than in itself, so all the goodness or comfortable influence which the creatures can communicate unto others is contained in a manner far more excellent in God's infinite goodness, which is likewise more communicative than any finite goodness can be. This infinite goodness dwelleth in Christ bodily; the spirit of all joy and gladness is given unto him, but without measure. It pleased God that in him should all fulness dwell; that as
504 we in this life from his fulness receive grace for grace, so in the better life, or life to come, we should receive joy for joy; that is, joy upon joy without ceasing, without end, even as much as we shall be capable of, yea above all that we are able to desire or conceive.

8. *Our life*, saith the apostle, Coloss. iii. 3, 4, *is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.* All, as many as have their fruit unto holiness in this life, have the pledge, the earnest, or the cocket of the next; but the life itself, whereof holiness is the pledge or cocket, is treasured up in Christ, and may not be delivered unto us until we be changed, until he appear in glory unchangeable. Whilst we see not him, we see not ourselves, or that life which is treasured up for us in him.

This sight is deferred or reserved until his appearance; then this sight shall grow into a perfect taste. So saith the same apostle, 1 Cor. xiii. 12: *Now we see through a glass;* that is, indistinctly, or as we see a truth locked up in a riddle; *but then*, when that which is perfect shall come, then shall we see *face to face: now*, saith the apostle of himself, *I know in part; but then shall I know even as I am known.*

St. John hath the like mystery more fully, 1 Epist. iii. 2: *Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.* From all these places, but chiefly from the last, it is apparent, that the fulness of our joys and happiness is from the vision or sight of God in Christ. And hence is this sight by the learned, and such as have insight in these mysteries, called *visio beatifica*, "the blessed vision," or the vision which makes us happy: yet happy it makes us, in that by it we become like unto him who is most happy, blessed, yea blessedness itself. This is St. John's inference, *we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is;* that is, not through a glass, but in a glass. Our understanding or intellective faculty is as a glass wherein this vision is made. Now the understanding, as the philosopher observed, is as a glass, apt to receive the impression of all things intelligible: and (as he imagined) could not be perfected, could never understand its own nature aright, until it were made all things, until it had received the images or stamps of all things. And hence it is, that the more men know, the more they desire to know. The knowledge of many particulars doth but excite our inbred desire of knowing more; and this desire can never be satisfied until we know all things. Now to know all things

successively, or one after another, is impossible. It was the complaint of the father of the physicians[c], *Ars longa, vita brevis.* The true knowledge of any art or science, or the subject of it, is long in getting, whereas man's life is short. *There is no end,* saith Solomon, *of writing many books; and much reading* (which is but the hunting after knowledge) *is a weariness unto the body.*

9. But it being taken as possible, or as granted, that we could come to know the nature of all things which we see, hear, or read of—that we could be as prompt and perfect in this visible book of nature, as we are in the first elements of the easiest book that can be printed for us—that we knew the nature of heaven, of earth, and of every creature in them, as distinctly as children do one letter from another—and the nature of mixed bodies, as well as they know the just value of letters or syllables put together, yet could not such knowledge make us happy. For these things, how perfectly soever known, could not infuse any new life into us, could not make us partakers of any greater joy or goodness than is in themselves. But in the life of glory our souls become living polished glasses, wherein the divine nature, wherein Christ God and
505 man, may be seen *as he is:* and he is truth itself, life itself, and goodness itself: and we are transformed into the similitude of all these his attributes.

There is no picture-maker that can express either the colour or proportion of a man's body or countenance so exactly as these do themselves in a true glass: it receives the true image and similitude of any thing visible, as more easily, so more exactly than wax doth the stamp and character of the seal: for that receives only the mathematical form or figure,

[c] Hippocrates.

without the matter or any real quality. As a golden seal leaves no tincture of gold, nor a seal of brass any property of brass in the wax, but only the figure; whereas a glass, besides the figure or proportion, receives the colour, but no other real quality.

But the eye, which is a kind of living glass, takes some tincture, not of the shape or colour only, but of other real qualities or properties of things seen. By looking on green or azure the eye is much refreshed, because the natural constitution of it resembles these most. Yet finds it not the like contentment either in colours too sad or too bright, because these have less affinity with its native temper. Nor is the effect or efficacy of colours seen, terminated only in the eye, though the eye sees them; that reacheth unto other internal faculties, unto the very seat or centre of the affections. The impression which colours perfectly red (as scarlet of the ancient die) make upon the eyes of living creatures which abound in blood, doth stir the blood, and enrage their spirits to fight, whenas otherwise they would be quiet: *And to the end they might provoke the elephants to fight, they shewed them the blood of grapes and mulberries*, 1 Macc. vi. 34. And some good philosophers have observed[d], that bears, or other creatures which abound with melancholic blood, are more enraged at the sight of colours more dark than scarlet or perfect red; so that the eyes of living creatures, which see things as they are, not through a glass, but in themselves as in a perfect glass, are apt to take others' impressions besides the figure, proportion, or colour of those things which they steadfastly behold.

10. There is no creature in the world more apt to receive the shape or figure of another, than man, in

[d] See book 10. chap. 9. [vol. ix. p. 54.]

his first creation, was to receive the image or likeness of his Creator, who hath no figure or shape whereby he may be visibly represented, as the seal is in the wax, or as a man's face is in a glass. He is infinite in all his attributes, and his infinity cannot be represented, must be admired.

The similitude (though) of his goodness, or of his righteousness, wherein happiness consists, was truly represented in the first man; for he was created just and holy, and wanted nothing to his happiness, save only perseverance in that righteousness wherein he was created. But he stained his soul with sin, and so far as it was stained with sin, it was more apt to take the image of God's adversary, who was the father of sin, the author of all iniquity which men commit, (and so we all are by nature more apt to take this image of the wicked one,) than the purest glass is to receive the image, the proportion, and colours of men that look upon it; more apt to take the impression of his bad qualities, than the eye of any living creature is to take the impression of any quality which shall be presented unto it.

But as *the first man Adam was made a living soul*, so *the last Adam was made a quickening spirit;* a spirit of life; to revive the relics of God's image in men's souls, and, by the reviving of them, to expel or blot out the expressions of Satan's image in them. All this he doth in part even in this life in such as
506 fear and love him. And in these two, to wit, in the reviving of God's image in us, and in the expunction and wiping out the stain of sin, (which is no other than the image of Satan,) doth our regeneration consist. And by the spirit of regeneration we see in part, we know God in part; but after that which is perfect is come, that is, when Christ shall appear in glory,

and we shall be changed, then shall that which is imperfect be done away; then shall our souls be as a glass, clear and polished, apt to receive the image of God wherein we were created in a far better manner than the soul of our first progenitor in his integrity was.

11. We know God by hearsay in this life, we see him not; or if we see him in part in his word, yet this is but like the sight of things afar off—it makes too little impression upon our souls—it works too small alteration in our affections—our sight is not effectual until it grow into a kind of taste. Adam was endued with life, with knowledge, with righteousness; but his life, his knowledge, and righteousness were changeable. *The life itself* and *the light of the world* was in the Son of God, John i. 3, and now dwelleth bodily in Christ, who is God and man: and when he shall appear, the life which is in him shall be imprinted on us, we shall be partakers of the life which is unchangeable.

And as he is life, so is he light itself, light unchangeable.

And when we shall see him as he is, our knowledge shall from this vision be, as he is, without possibility of change, without decay or diminution. *God*, saith the apostle, *is love;* and *when we shall see him as he is*, we shall become like him in this attribute also; that is, as his love to us was everlasting without beginning, so our love to him shall be uncessant, unchangeable, without ending. And what expression of true happiness can be more full, than to be everlastingly beloved of him who is love itself, and to love him everlastingly?

The fruition of all things which we desire, or love, cannot be so much as the fruition of him, who, as he is

all things else, so is he love itself. And (as was said before) although we have all things else which our hearts desire, yet till we enjoy his presence we cannot have our heart's desire; we cannot have the accomplishment of our love until we enjoy his presence, who is love itself. But some will ask, What shall we do that we may enjoy the comfort of his everlasting love and presence? The psalmist hath told us in few words, psalm xxxvii. 4: *Delight thou in the Lord; and he shall give thee thy heart's desire.* But how shall we delight in him whom we have not seen, or how should we love him whom we know not?

We must take notice of our love to God, who is invisible, from the experience of our love unto our brethren whom we have seen: we cannot assure ourselves that we delight in him, unless we delight in his saints that are on earth. This is the importance of St. John's words, *He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?*

12. These are the usual marks or tokens whereby we are taught to know the truth of our love towards God, and of our allegiance to Christ. But many there be who call themselves brethren, which have no other bond of brotherhood than Simeon and Levi had. Many there be which boast in the communion of saints, which have no other union than such as Corah, Dathan, and Abiram had, an union in conspiracy against Moses and Aaron, against the visible church and her governors.

The papists will tell you, that the communion of saints is amongst them in their Church: so will the Brownists and other separatists: so will such as live amongst us, and yet complain of the burden of cere-
507 monies in our church. And how shall men (the unlearned especially) know which of all these, or whether

any of these, are the true brethren of Christ, or the saints in which we are bound to delight? This, as will be replied, you may know by their delight in hearing the word; for he that loveth God loveth his word; he that delights in God delighteth in his word; yea, but many delight in the outward letter of the word only, or in the word as it is interpreted by teachers of their own faction, or after their own fancy; men either not able to discern the evidence of truth, or not willing to have it manifested unto them. And how then shall any man know whether he love the Lord, whether he delight in the Lord, by delighting in any of their societies which pretend themselves to be Christ's brethren, to be God's saints?

Surely there is a better way than all these to delight aright in the Lord, and to know that we delight in him, and yet a way made known unto us by God's word: a way, a direct and plain way, which we cannot follow but by sincerely delighting in his word.

The word of God doth tell us, (and all sorts or sects of men confess it,) that *God is love*, that he is *righteousness*, that he is *holiness*, that he is *the God of all peace*, that he *is good to all*, that he *is merciful and longsuffering*. Now he that in these things doth imitate God, he that is charitable and loving to all —he that is merciful and beneficial to all, so far as his means will suffer him—he that deals justly and truly with his neighbour—he that doth delight in so doing, he doth truly *delight in the Lord*, and the Lord in his good time shall give him *his heart's desire*.

As there is a sincerity of conversation required towards men, so likewise there is a purity of heart and conscience towards God; and he that delights in this, or seeks after this, doth delight in the Lord, and

he only shall truly know that he delights in the Lord, or that his hope is steadfast. For *every one*, as St. John saith, *that hath this hope*, to wit, of seeing God as he is, *doth purify himself, as he is pure:* and our Saviour saith, (as a blessing to the pure in heart,) that *they shall see God.* They shall see him in this life in his word, and in his works; and in the life to come they shall see him as he is, and be partakers of everlasting life, which is the crown of purity and holiness.

CHAP. XXII.

ROMANS VI. 22, 23.

But now ..... ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life. ..... The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Of the accidental joys of the life to come. A particular terrar or map of the kingdom prepared for the blessed ones, in a paraphrase upon the eight beatitudes, or the blessedness promised to the eight qualifications set down in St. Matthew, chapter v. *Eternal life the strongest obligation to all duties. Satan's two usual ways of tempting us: either* per blanda *or* per aspera.

1. BUT if in the next life we enjoy his presence who is life itself, who is love itself, who is all in all, at whose right hand is fulness of pleasures for evermore, what need is there of any access of accidental or concomitant joys? It is true, there is no need of them, 508 for so they should not be accidental. Therefore are they called accidental, because such as enjoy God's presence might be fully happy without them. So God himself is most happy in himself, he is happiness itself. Yet even in this, that he is goodness itself, that he is happiness itself, he communicates both goodness and happiness to his creatures, so far as they are capable of them, not by any necessity, but

Accidental joys.

freely. And when it is said, that *when we shall see him as he is, we shall be like him*, part of this likeness doth herein consist, that we shall communicate this goodness and happiness to others, so far as they are capable of it. So that the accidental or concomitant joys of the life to come, (whose essence consists in the fruition of God, as he is love,) although superabundant, yet are they not superfluous. There is no waste, there is nothing poured out from one which shall not be received (in the same measure or manner) by another.

But wherein do these concomitant or accidental joys consist? especially in these two particulars:

The beauteous place.

First, In the glorious beauty of the place, which is called *sedes beatorum*, the "seat or mansion of the blessed."

The holy company.

Secondly, In the society or company of such as are so seated, and made partakers of that essential blessedness, which consists in the sight and vision of God, as he is happiness itself. For *visio amati est fruitio:* this is that which the schools call "the fruition or enjoying of God's presence." Now, that either the place or the society of saints and angels can add (or confer any thing) to our happiness, this proceeds from God's special presence in both.

First, in regard of the place or seat of the blessed.

2. To begin with the place or seat of the blessed. How pleasant soever our seat on earth may be, yet this world itself is but *vallis lachrymarum*, "a valley of tears," wherein some rueful spectacles are daily presented to our eyes—wherein some woful news or unpleasant sounds possess our ears. To hear and see what we now daily hear and see, though we were spectators only, but no actors, would abate our joy, would be an alloy to our present happiness. Hence it is that St. John, describing the accidental joys of the life to come, saith, Rev. xxi. 1, *I saw a new heaven*

and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And again, ver. 4: *God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.* His meaning is, not only that no man there shall have occasion to cry, or that no sorrow or pain shall breed there, but that there shall be no sorrow, no cry there, by way of sympathy; that is, no ungrateful sound or spectacle shall approach their dwelling in the holy city, which he describes at large in the same chapter, ver. 11. unto the end. The compass and form of it you have ver. 16: *It lieth foursquare, the length as large as the breadth: twelve thousand furlongs. And the building of the wall of it was of jasper: and the city was pure gold, like unto clear glass,* ver. 18, &c. Thus he describes the beautiful materials of the place, by the most glorious and most precious materials which this world affords. And yet that is true of this description which the apostle saith of the rites and ceremonies of the law: *The gates of pearl,* and *the streets of gold, transparent as glass,* are no better than *shadows of the good things to come,* which are treasured up in that heavenly kingdom for all such as love Christ Jesus, and the glory of his coming.

509 Now though it be true, that in God's house there be many mansions, yet is not the beauty or glory of them appropriated to one, nor divisible amongst some few, but alike common to all; one hath not the less comfort there because another hath more. Those two quarrelling pronouns *meum* and *tuum* shall be excluded thence as common barrators. One cannot say to another, 'This part of this glorious kingdom is mine, that is yours;' for every one that shall be accounted

worthy to be an heir of that kingdom, shall be as entire an heir as if he were sole heir. So it is not amongst the kings of the earth; the greater dominions one hath, or the further he extends them, the less he leaves unto his neighbours.

There is some small resemblance of the condition of the blessed ones in heaven to be found in our hearing, sight, and knowledge of things which we have here on earth—a great multitude may hear a speech, and every one hear all. No man hath less comfort from the light or heat of the sun by another's enjoying it (unless he purposely stand between the sun and him). No man is prejudiced, but rather furthered by another man's extraordinary knowledge, specially of matters heavenly, and not divisible into parts. Howbeit here is a vast difference whilst we live on earth, even when there is no matter of prejudice to any other, but rather of benefit or advantage to many; yet there is matter too much of envy, for that breeds within man's self, it comes not by infection from without. But so it is not in the place of bliss, in the heavenly city, into which no unclean thing, no unclean thought, specially no envy, no uncharitableness, shall enter.

3. As is the place, so is the company or society. Every one is loving, every one is lovely; all be sons of peace; their love and peace is mutual: *Ye are come unto mount Sion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling.* Hebrews xii. 22, &c. In regard of the company there.

There is no question (at least there ought none to

to be) but that the essential joy or blessedness of the life to come shall not be arithmetically equal, that is, the measure of it shall not be one and the same in all; for every man shall be rewarded according to his ways. The eternal life, which is the gift of God, is the award, not of commutative justice, nor of distributive, though if so it were, it should be awarded according to geometrical proportion; but it is an act of mercy or bounty; and being such, there is no question but he that loved God more in this world than others, shall have a greater proportion in his love. No question but he which hath received a greater talent, and hath employed it as well or better than he that hath received less, shall have a greater reward; and he which hath been more faithful in his master's service, or he in whom the kingdom of grace hath entered further in this life, shall enter further into his Master's joy, shall partake more fully of the kingdom of heaven. And according to the lesser or greater measure of essential happiness, shall the measure of their expressions of joy or thanksgiving be. And yet the joy which amounts from their mutual expressions shall be equal and the same to all. For though every one cannot so fully express his joy or thanksgiving as another doth, yet he that comes short of others in this expression, shall joy even in this, that God is more or better glorified by another than by himself; and such is the disposition of these heavenly inhabitants, that, so God's name be
510 truly glorified by all, they respect not by whom it be comparatively most glorified. There are no envious comparisons there, seeing every one of them hath his full portion in that public and common joy which amounts from their joint expressions of thanksgiving. The ditty of their song is the same, and no man there shall be either deaf or silent.

4. This inequality of essential joy, and this equality of joy accidental, cannot (to my apprehension) be better represented, than by a chorus or choir of voices, well skilled and practised to hold perfect consort. Amongst a great number thus qualified, it cannot be expected that every one shall have either the like clearness or sweetness of voice, or the like command over his voice, that another hath. Nor can he that hath the best natural voice, or best skill in singing, impart or communicate either his voice or skill unto others, which sing in consort with him; and yet every one is partaker of the sweetness of another's voice as well as of his own. The consent or harmony is alike to all that have musical ears; and a man, even in this life, is ofttimes more delighted to hear another man than himself sing, either alone or in consort; but most delight in a full chorus, a choir or consort. After this manner, the blessed saints and angels shall not impart any part of that internal joy or happiness, which ariseth from the fruition or vision of the God of love, unto another; nor shall he have any need of it, as we say, at the second hand: for every one shall have as much of it within himself as he is capable of.

But of that external joy, which results from their joint consort in singing praise and glory unto God, every one shall be partaker, and the more they are, the greater shall be every one's portion of this delight or joy. And thus much of life eternal, and of the blessedness which is contained in it, or is the property of it; whether it be blessedness essential or concomitant.

5. Yet some there be which give a more particular terrar, or distinct map of this heavenly life or kingdom, out of St. Matthew's Gospel, chap. v. And many excellent descants upon our Saviour's words in that

The eight beatitudes, Matt. v.

place you may find in authors ancient and modern, in all such as comment upon the eight beatitudes (as they call them). Yet whilst you read or hear them, take this memorandum with you, that there are not eight several beatitudes distinct one from another, for all are contained in this one word, to wit, eternal life, which is but one and the same; the joy or happiness, which is the property of it, is the same; it hath not eight several branches, albeit our Saviour pronounce this blessedness eight several times.

What then? Are these but so many tautologies or repetition of one and the same thing? God forbid we should so think or speak of him who spake as never man spake! Or is there a mystery in the number of eight? None, questionless, in the abstract number. All the mystery (if it be to be termed a mystery) is in the reference of one and the same blessedness to eight several qualifications, without which no man shall be partaker of the life to come; and to eight sorts of men, unto whom according to their several qualifications or conditions one and the same blessedness comes more welcome under one style or title, than it would do under another, especially whilst it is proffered, not as present or *in re*, but as future and *in spe*, as a thing far off, whilst it is yet under promise.

The first beatitude, *poor in spirit.*

6. The first promise of this blessedness is unto such as are *poor in spirit;* that is, to men free from secular ambition, to men of an humble mind. The greatest grievance which men thus qualified and affected in this life suffer, is, that they are in a manner trod upon by others, and for the most part excluded from rule or jurisdiction; inferiors to all, superiors to none. And if they be as poor in wealth as spirit, there is a kind of necessity laid upon them

511

for continuing such; for his observation is not yet out of date; *Pauper eris semper si pauper es æmiliane, munera non dantur nunc, nisi divitibus:* "If a man be once poor, he shall be always poor; for no man grows rich by gifts, but he that is able to give."

Now to encourage such as already are *poor in spirit* to continue this resolution, and to arm their humility with constancy against all the secular inconveniences or grievances wherewith it is charged, the blessedness of the life to come is promised to them under the name or title of *a kingdom: Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven*, Matt. v. 3; that is, they are nearer to life eternal, to true happiness and glory, than ambitious or aspiring minds, which have not a desire only, but ofttimes means and opportunity to attain to honour and dominion over others here on earth. This affection of poorness in spirit is the first degree and step to blessedness; and with reference to this, scarcity of means, or external poverty, is for some men more expedient than wealth; for though many be humbled which are not humble, yet few are humble which have not been first humbled by some cross or affliction.

Second beatitude, for mourners.

7. But many are *poor in spirit* which have no extraordinary occasion to spend their days in mourning. Unto such as truly mourn, the very conceit or mention of pomp or jollity is ungrateful. To provoke them to mirth, until nature have her forth, is unseasonable, a kind of sin; to tell them of a kingdom, were all one as to mock them; yet none there are, who truly mourn, which do not seriously desire comfort, though it be but in mourning with them. And for this reason it is, that unto such as mourn, our Saviour promises the blessedness of the life to come, not under the style or title of *a kingdom*, but under a title more grateful,

and that is *comfort: Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted*, ver. 4; so they mourn not as those that have no hope; so they murmur not, nor repine at God's providence. As for mourning itself, it is a branch of evil, a kind of punishment or chastisement, no way pleasant for the present. Comfort, in the sacred dialect, includes abundance of good things, as appears by Abraham's answer unto Dives, Luke xvi. 25: *Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.* The very joys of heaven could not have been so sweet to Lazarus, unless in this life he had wanted comfort.

The third beatitude, to the meek spirited ones.

8. Many again have just occasion to mourn; and, whilst these occasions last, do not transgress in the manner of their mourning: they repine not at God; are not malicious against the men which find them matter to mourn for; and yet for all this are not of so meek a spirit as every good Christian, when occasion or exigences of time require it, should be.

This qualification includes somewhat more, or somewhat besides poorness in spirit, or humility, or patience in mourning. Meekness is a moderation of anger in some special cases; such a temper as our Saviour requires in his followers, when he commands them to turn the right cheek to him that smites them on the left; and to be willing to redeem their peace with a troublesome neighbour that would take away the coat, though it be with the loss of the cloak also. (Matt. v. 39, 40[e].) Now this kind of temper exposeth men to many kinds of inconveniences hard to be digested by flesh and blood. Many otherwise humble

[e] See chap. 11. sect. 7. [p. 183. of this volume.]

and ingenuous, when they are touched (as we say, in their copyhold, or) in their inheritance, will take courage and boldness, sometimes more than were fitting, though necessary, if they be resolved to defend 512
their own, without respect to the occasions or exigences of time; for *facies hominis in causa propria tanquam facies leonis*, "a man's face or presence in his own cause is as the face of a lion." And he that cannot take his own part in his own cause, and set the best foot forwards, may easily be turned out of house and home. And yet there is no true disciple of Christ but must expect to have his patience exercised in this kind—to be injuriously vexed and molested by others for that which is not theirs.

Now he that in this case will not vex or molest others again, nor himself, he is truly meek; and unto men thus qualified, or to encourage all to be thus qualified, the blessedness of the life to come is promised, not under the title of *a kingdom*, or of *comfort*, but under the title most contrary to the course and custom of this world, wherein meekness is commonly accursed with loss of their own possession; but, *blessed*, saith our Saviour, *are the meek: for they shall inherit* or possess *the earth*, or the land, even that good land, where there is no ejection, no disinheriting of such as are possessed of it: and therefore are the meek blessed, because meekness or quietness is the way or title to get possession thereof.

The fourth beatitude, to those that hunger and thirst after righteousness.

9. But *the poor in spirit* may have more honour than they can desire; so may such as *mourn* have as much comfort; and *the meek* as large and durable an inheritance as their hearts could wish: but if this were all, they could not be satisfied. Every one of these have in this life their several thirsts or longings; as he that *mourns* thirsts after comfort; *the poor in*

spirit and *the meek* hunger and thirst after their contentment in some kind or other; but without all hope of satisfaction, unless they hunger and thirst after somewhat else besides these particular contentments. Man in his first estate was created righteous; and unless there be a longing after that righteousness which our first parents lost, whatsoever we gain or get besides cannot satisfy our desire either *in re* or *in spe*. Hence saith our Saviour, in the fourth place, *Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.* There is a thirst after honour, preferment, and ease; and there is *auri sacra fames*, "an unquenchable hunger after gold and pelf;" but this cannot be satisfied; all these are tortures to the soul wherein they harbour. For though honour be God's; though gold and silver, as the prophet speaks, be his: yet he is not these; these are not the same that he is: but (as we said lately) God is righteousness, he is peace, he is love, he is mercy; and therefore whosoever delights in these, he truly delights in the Lord, and shall assuredly have his heart's desire; he only shall be satisfied.

The fifth beatitude, to the merciful.

10. But no man in this life doth or can delight in these works as he ought: the most righteous man that ever lived on earth, if God should enter into judgment with him, could not be absolved from the sentence of the law; and so long as he stands unabsolved, or uncertain of his absolution, he cannot be satisfied, he cannot have his heart's desire, he always stands in need of mercy. And mercy he shall have that is merciful; for it is remarkable, that this qualification of mercifulness is the only qualification or condition which is rewarded in kind: in this we most perfectly resemble the goodness of God.

Hence saith our Saviour, *Blessed are the merciful.*

But why are they blessed? Not because they shall receive a kingdom, not because they shall possess the land, not because they shall be satisfied, but because *they shall obtain mercy.* Without the exceeding mercy of God no man can enter into the kingdom of heaven; neither into the kingdom of grace in this life, nor into the kingdom of glory in the life to come: and he that 513
means to enter in at the gate of mercy must bring his ticket, or rather his counterpart indented with him [f]; *he must be merciful, as his heavenly Father is merciful,* otherwise he shall be excluded.

Righteousness towards God, if it were possible to be severed from mercy towards man, could not suffice.

11. But that which comes nearest to true blessedness itself is purity of heart. This contains the root whereof holiness is the fruit; that holiness, whose end is everlasting life. Now he that desires to keep this purity of heart must deprive his eyes of many pleasant sights, and his ears of many delightful sounds, and every sense of those particular contentments wherein the world most delighteth. But in lieu of this loss, he hath a blessing promised, not only of this life, but of the life to come. In the life to come he shall see God as he is, *face to face;* and in this life he shall see him as through a glass; and so he shall see him in his word and in his attributes: and the best knowledge that in this life can be had—the knowledge of God and of his attributes, without transforming the divine nature into the similitude of our corrupt affections—is, to see his righteousness and justice, without derogation from his mercy or goodness; or to see him to be goodness itself and mercy itself, without any diminution of his justice; to see his gracious and pe-

The sixth beatitude, to the pure in heart.

[f] See Master Mede's notion of *θεμέλιον καλὸν*, upon psal. cxii. 6.

culiar favour towards some, without suspicion or imagination of rigour or cruelty towards others; to know him to be love itself, without admixture of hatred towards any thing that he hath made.

The seventh beatitude, to the peacemakers.

12. It is this sight of God, or this apprehension of this uniformity between his attributes, which must transform us into such a similitude of his divine nature as in this life can be had; that is, such as may make us the children of peace. This is the immediate fruit of purity of heart; and unto men thus disposed to preserve peace as for their own particulars, and to make peace between such as are at variance, the blessedness of the life to come could not be promised under a more grateful title, than under the style or title of being called *the sons of God*. And under this style it is promised, ver. 9: *Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the sons of God.*

Patience and resolution in suffering for righteousness.

13. Yet all these qualifications were not sufficient, unless they be accompanied with a firm and constant resolution to suffer persecution—all the persecution that flesh and blood can in this life devise against them—rather than they should forego their humility, their mourning, their meekness, their love of righteousness, their mercifulness, and purity of heart towards God. There must be a greater love of all these qualifications here mentioned than of ourselves, otherwise we shall be uncapable of the least portion of the blessedness here so often promised. This patience in suffering, or constant resolution to endure persecution, is the very girdle or tie of all other Christian virtues; and for this reason it is twice repeated; *Blessed are they that suffer persecution for righteousness' sake*, ver. 10; and again, ver. 11, *Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you*, &c.

14. Many may be forward to suffer persecution, yea

to affect it; but as he said, ***Res ingeniosa est esse Christianum;*** "It is a matter of extraordinary wit to be a true Christian; unto true martyrdom there is required, not only sobriety of spirit, but of judgment; for none can be a martyr, but he that *suffers for righteousness' sake*, or for Christ's sake, who is such a fountain of righteousness as the sun is of light. Now to discern true righteousness from pretended, or to sever Christ's cause from our own particular interest or engagements, is a point of extraordinary skill. Whereas it is an easy matter to pawn our fame or credit, our very lives, in maintenance of that which we 514
have boldly avouched to be true and just. None were more forward to sacrifice themselves for their religion than were the Jews, which yet blasphemed the name of Christ, and the ways of truth, after they had crucified the Lord of truth and of glory; none more forward than they to raise up persecution against the apostles and disciples in every city; and albeit many of them were put to cruel and ignominious deaths for their stiff adherence to Moses' law, as they imagined; yet martyrs they were not, because they died not for Moses' sake, nor for his sake for whom Moses wrote, but for maintenance of their own perverse opinions and affections: for though they abhorred the idols of the heathen, yet they committed more abominable sacrilege than the heathens did; for of all kinds of idolatry or sacrilegious worship, the most untoward and least to be pitied, is, when men are prone to sacrifice themselves to their own pride or headstrong ignorance.

15. The truth is, that no man can suffer persecution for righteousness' sake, but he that is a follower of righteousness, and a son of peace. No man can suffer persecution for Christ's and the gospel's sake, but he

that hath learned of Christ to be humble and meek. And for this reason haply it is, that unto such as suffer persecution, whether in their body or good name, (so they suffer it for Christ's name,) the blessedness of the life to come is promised: first, under the same style or title that it was unto *the poor in spirit;* he had said of these, ver. 3, that *theirs is the kingdom of heaven;* and of those, ver. 10, *Blessed are they that are persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.*

As also, secondly, under the same title that it is promised to the meek, of whom he had said, ver. 5, *Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.* And unto such as are reviled and persecuted falsely for his sake, he addeth, ver. 12, *Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven.*

Eternal life the strongest motive and obligation to all duty.

16. And thus hath our Saviour taught us the use and application of all that hath been delivered concerning eternal life; and the use or application of it is as general and large as are the commandments of God. There is no duty enjoined whereunto the hope or belief of this eternal reward doth not enable and bind us. This was the first lesson our Saviour taught after he entered upon his prophetical function; and it is the last article in our creed. It is, as Christ himself is, *Imus, angularis lapis, et summus;* "It is both the foundation stone, and that which bindeth all the building[g];" nor need we be afraid to do well *intuitu mercedis,* with respect to recompense or reward, seeing Christ himself, when he first begun to preach the glad tidings of the gospel, did make no promise of reward save only to such as *continue in well doing,*

[g] See chap. 10. sect. 7. [p. 152. of this volume.]

or *suffer evil* with patience. And his apostle St. Paul, exhorting us to cheerfulness *in well doing*, and patience in suffering, proposeth the like hope of reward; making Christ Jesus himself a pattern for us to follow.

Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, let us lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and finisher of our faith; who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God. Heb. xii. 1, 2.

Nor is it possible for flesh and blood to resist either their proper enticements or the temptations of Satan, much less to vanquish this tempter, by any other means than by serious meditation upon the several rewards proposed unto such as shall overcome, and of 515
the several punishments which are threatened and shall be awarded unto all such as forsake the field, and neglect the service of God. And though it be true, that we must obtain this victory by the Spirit of God, yet one special means by which the Spirit of God obtains this victory for us, is, by representing and imprinting such punishments or plagues as are dreadful and fearful even to flesh and blood; so that the flesh must be affrighted and deterred from or forth of the ways of sin *by the wages of sin* [h]; and the Spirit of God which is in man must be daily animated and encouraged by the hope of heavenly joys, whose very nature and quality is spiritual. The flesh or sensitive part cannot truly apprehend the joys of the spirit;

[h] 1 Cor. x.

nor is the spirit so capable or so apprehensive of deadly punishment or pain as the sensitive or animal part is.

17. To branch this use or application which our Saviour makes of this point into his proper particulars. Though it be true that all of us are the seed of rebellious parents, and have gone astray from the womb, as well by sins of omission as of commission; yet that which the heathen philosopher long since observed, if it be candidly interpreted, and with such charity as becometh Christians, is likewise true; *Nemo sponte malus:* No man in his first aim and intentions desires to be disobedient, seditious, or factious; to be an adulterer or murderer; a fornicator; a thief or perjured man; or to look upon his neighbour's conveniences with an envious or malicious eye[i].

The motives Satan uses to withdraw us.

The means by which Satan tempts us, or by which our natural affections sway us to do these things in particular, as to be disobedient, seditious, factious, or servants to other lewdness, are generally two—*per blanda, aut per aspera;* by proposing some things unto us which respectively either promise some contentment to our senses, or threaten some loss, some pain or vexation. This visible world, and the things which we see or know by sensible experiment, are as Satan's chess-board, which way soever we look or turn our thoughts, he hath somewhat or other still ready at hand to give our weak and untrained desires the check, and to hazard the losing of our souls and bodies.

But *faith* (as the apostle speaks) *is the evidence of things not seen;* and *the things that are not seen* (as the apostle saith) *are eternal;* and these are for number so many, and for worth so great, that if we

[i] See book 10. ch. 21. [vol. ix. p. 123. of this edition.]

be as vigilant and careful to play our own game as he is to play his, for every check which he can give us we may give him the checkmate. And this advantage we have of him, that whereas he usually tempts us but one way at one and the same time; that is, either by hopes of some sensual contentment, or by fear of some temporal vexation, loss, or pain; we may at the same time resist his temptations two ways: both by proposal of some spiritual good or reward, much greater than the particular sensible contentment, and by representation of some spiritual loss or fear, much more dangerous than any evil wherewith he can threaten or deter us from performance of our duty.

19. If he tempt us to excess in meat and drink, which is commonly the root whence other branches of luxury or sensuality spring, we may counterpoise this temptation, first, with that hunger and thirst, and other torments incident to this appetite of sense, in the life to come; and in the second place, by our hopes of our celestial food, or full satisfaction of our hunger and thirst, so we will but hunger and thirst after righteousness. And so again, if he tempt us to other unclean pleasures of the flesh, we may give our inclinations the check, by proposing unto them our assured 516
hope of enjoying the society of immaculate angels, and of our espousal to the immaculate Lamb Christ Jesus in this life, and of enjoying his presence in the life to come. And again, we may control our natural inclination to this branch of lewdness by serious meditation on that divine oracle, *Adulterers and whoremongers God will judge;* and judging, condemn them to *everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.*

20. If Satan shall tempt us to an immoderate desire of riches, the counterpoise to this temptation is like-

wise twofold; first, there is a promise of treasure in heaven to such as seek after it more than earthly treasure; and this is a treasure not chargeable with the like carking care in getting it, nor subject to the like inconveniences after it be gotten; for there *neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, nor do thieves break through and steal.* Besides, the heaps of riches even in this life are fruitless; for as our Saviour saith in another place, though a man have riches in great abundance, yet *his life doth not consist in them.* Ten thousand talents cannot add one minute to the length of his days; whereas the heavenly treasures are the crown of life. Or if the hope of these heavenly treasures cannot oversway men's thirst or longing after earthly treasures, you may join to this the weight of St. James's woe against this sin, chap. v. 1, 2, 3: *Go to now ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted, and your garments are motheaten. Your gold and silver is cankered; and the rust of them shall be a witness against you.*

But if this were all, a rich worldling would reply, that he would keep his gold and silver from rust. This he may do perhaps whilst he is alive, but more than he can undertake after it once come unto Plutus's custody; therefore St. James adds, *the rust of it shall eat your flesh as fire:* or if this be but a metaphor, he speaks no parables, but plainly, in the words following: *Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth.* vv. 3, 4.

21. Again, if Satan tempt us to do those things

which we ought not to do, for the favour, or to leave those things undone which we ought to do, for the fear of great ones, the sacred armory affords us weapons sufficient to repel both temptations. The first is that pithy sentence of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 23: *Ye are bought with a price; be not ye the servants of men.* The second is that of our Saviour, Luke xii. 4, 5: *Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him.* Briefly, in all assaults Satan hath only weapons offensive, as fiery darts; he hath none defensive: but if the word of God, as our apostle speaks, dwell plentifully in us, we have both the shield and buckler to repel his darts, and the sword of the spirit to chase him away; but this word must plentifully dwell in us; we must entertain it in our hearts and consciences, not only in our lips and tongues; nor let it run out of our mouths faster than it comes into our ears.

CHAP. XXIII. 517

ROMANS VI. 23.

For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The philosopher's precept, Sustine et abstine, *though good in its kind, and in some degree useful, yet insufficient. True belief of the article of the everlasting life and death is able to effect both abstinence from evil doing, and sufferance of evil for well doing. The sad effects of the misbelief or unbelief of this article of life and death eternal. The true belief of it includes a taste of both. Direction how to take a taste of death eternal without danger. Turkish principles produce effects to the shame of Christians. Though hell fire*

be material, it may pain the soul. The story of Biblis. The body of the second death fully adequate to the body of sin. Parisiensis's story. A general and useful rule.

The philosophical precept, *Sustine et abstine*, imperfectly good.

1. THE heathen philosopher, which knew no tempter besides himself, no temptation but such as the daily occurrences of what he heard or saw, or by some sense of the body had experience of, did acknowledge as much as hath been formerly delivered out of God's word; to wit, that men are usually misdrawn to do those things in particular which in general they desired not to do, and to leave those things undone which in the calm of composed affections they desired to do, either by the hope of some bodily pleasures, or by fear of some bodily pain.

And unto this twofold inconvenience he prescribed this brief receipt, ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου: that men (in youth especially) should accustom themselves to abstinence and sufferance; to abstinence from evil, and to sufferance of evil; that is, unto abstinence from unlawful pleasures, which we call *malum culpæ*, or evil of sin; and to endure with patience *malum pœnæ*, the evil of pain, or of some loss, rather than hazard the quiet of conscience by doing that which is evil or unlawful, or by not doing that which is good, specially when we are thereto required.

But this brief receipt or diet of the soul, without some other addition, will rather serve to condemn us Christians, than enable us to live a true and Christian life: the receipt though is good in the general, but defective in these particulars:

First, unless he knew more of God's will, or of the mysteries of Christian religion, than we know any means by which he could possibly know either, being an heathen, he was ignorant of many evils from which he was bound to abstain, and altogether as

ignorant what those good things were, for whose love he was to suffer *malum pœnæ*, the evil of pain, loss or grievance, rather than disclaim them.

Secondly, albeit he had known what was to be done, what to be left undone, yet being ignorant of this main article of Christianity, to wit, of a life everlasting, which is the reward of well doing, the crown of holiness, and of an everlasting death, which is the wages of sin, and issue of unlawful pleasures; his receipt of *sustine et abstine* was altogether as fruitless and vain, as if a physician should prescribe a dosis or recipe to his patient of such simples or compounded medicines as cannot be had in this part of the world, but must be sought for at the East or West Indies, or at the antipodes, whence there is no hope they can be brought before the patient be laid in his grave: the medicine which he prescribes is nowhere to be found 518
but in the word of God: the simples whereof it is compounded can grow from no other root or branch than from the articles of everlasting life and everlasting death. The belief of the one is the root of abstinence from sinful or unlawful pleasures; the belief of the other is the root of patience or sufferance of *malum pœnæ*, or of sufferance for well doing: howbeit, to speak exactly, both parts of his receipt may be had from the belief either of everlasting life or everlasting death, but most completely from the belief of both.

Belief of this article will work obedience.

The manner how thence they may be gathered is expressed by our apostle St. Paul, Rom. viii. 16, 17, 18, &c.: *The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ; if so be that we suffer with him, that we may be also glorified together. For I reckon that the sufferings*

of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us, &c.

2. If all the sufferings of this life be not worthy of the glory which shall be revealed in us, as the rule of faith teacheth us, then conscience and reason itself binds us to suffer all the persecutions or grievances which can be laid upon us, rather than hazard our hopes or forfeit our interests in the glory that shall be revealed in all such as with patience suffer persecution, or other temporal loss or detriment, for the truth's sake. And this hope of glory is as the root whence Christian patience or sufferance must grow. So is the fear of everlasting death the root of our abstinence from evil, or of repentance for former want of this abstinence. This is the same apostle's doctrine, 2 Cor. v. 10, 11: *For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men.* To what doth he persuade men? To do those things which are good, and which being done shall be rewarded, not in judgment, but in mercy and lovingkindness; those things by which we shall be reconciled unto God.

But were not these Corinthians reconciled to God before our apostle thus persuaded them? Yes, so saith the apostle, 2 Cor. v. 18: *God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ.* And when our apostle and those to whom he wrote were reconciled unto God through Jesus Christ, we that are now living were by the same means reconciled unto God; for *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.* Now if the world, that is, not this or that man, not this or that generation of men, but all generations, the world

of mankind, were reconciled unto God when our apostle wrote this epistle, yea, when Christ offered himself upon the cross, what need is there of any further reconciliation; for that which God doth he doth most perfectly, most completely?

3. It is true, our reconciliation was most perfectly, most completely wrought on God's part by Christ's death upon the cross; he paid the full price of our redemption, of our reconciliation; nothing may or can be added thereto. Yet a reconciliation there is to be wrought on our parts; though wrought it cannot be but by the Spirit of God; and wrought it is not ordinarily but by the ministry of men, as God's deputies or ambassadors. So the apostle adds, ver. 19: *God hath committed to us*, to wit, his ministers, *the word of reconciliation*[k]. *Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though Christ did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to God.* So then God hath reconciled us all unto himself from the hour of Christ's death; and yet every one of us, for his own particular, must be reconciled to God by the ministry of his ambassadors: and the efficacy of their ministry is demonstrated by working true repentance in us. The means again by which they work 519
this true repentance must be by representing the terror of the Lord, or, as our apostle saith, Acts xvii. 30, 31, by putting them in mind of the last and dreadful day: *The times of this ignorance* (to wit, of the old world before Christ's death) *God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath*

[k] Of reconciliation active, or, grammatically, passive only, and reconciliation really passive, see book 10. [vol. ix. p. 538. of this edition.]

ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. Thus you see how the terror of the last day, or fear of everlasting death, must work in us an abstinence from evil, or repentance for evil past, as the hope of everlasting life doth work patience and constancy in persecution.

Yet both parts of that brief receipt, *sustine et abstine*, may be effected by our serious meditation upon either branch of our belief concerning life and death everlasting; for if all *the sufferings of this life be not worthy of* or equivalent unto *the glory which shall be revealed in us*, we must needs be worthy of and obnoxious to everlasting death, if we do not with patience suffer persecution in this life, rather than hazard our hopes of life eternal.

Again; if the sufferance of everlasting death be much worse than the suffering of all persecutions possible in this life, our not repentance at the terror of it doth make us uncapable of everlasting life. Our hopes of avoiding it by repentance, if they be sound and firm, will animate, and in a manner impel us to follow the ways of life, *to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance.*

4. Seeing then we are thus environed on the right hand and on the left, having the hopes of eternal life set before us to encourage us to constancy and resolution, and are so strongly beset with inevitable fear of everlasting death, if, like fainthearted soldiers, we should retreat, or revoke our vow in baptism, may not the Lord in justice take up that complaint against us which sometimes he did against Jerusalem and Judah—*What could I have done more for my vineyard, that I have not done unto it?* Other means to make men either good men or good citizens the old world knew

none; nor could the wit of the wisest lawgivers devise any besides *pœna et præmium*, "reward and punishment." Now what kingdom or commonwealth had either so bountiful rewards or so dreadful punishments proposed unto them as we Christians have? What then is the reason why we of all others are more defective in good duties, most fruitful in evil, less observant or more desperate transgressors of our Prince's laws, than the subjects or citizens of any other well governed kingdoms ever were? How often do we pawn our hopes of everlasting life upon less occasions than Esau did his birthright, and set Christ, our acknowledged Lord and Redeemer, to sale at a lower price than Judas did?

The original of this our desperate neglect or contempt must either be misbelief or unbelief of the reward promised to well doing, or of the punishment threatened to evil doers. And it would be a point very hard to determine, whether, of such as make any conscience of their ways, especially since the reformation of religion, more have miscarried through misbelief or through unbelief of this great article of our creed—everlasting life and everlasting death. Our misbelief, for the most part, concerns the article of everlasting life. Of everlasting death, we are rather unbelievers than misbelievers.

Misbelief always includes a strong belief; but the stronger our belief, the more dangerous it is, if it be wrested or misplaced; and the worst way we can misplace our belief of heavenly joys is, when we make ourselves certain of our salvation before our time, or rank ourselves amongst the elect, or heirs not disinheritable of the heavenly kingdom, before we have made our election sure.

5. As the absolute infallibility of the present Romish 520

church doth make up the measure of heathenish idolatry or iniquity; so the immature belief of our own salvation or election doth make up the measure of Jewish or Pharisaical hypocrisy. The manner how it doth so is this: If no covetous, if no sacrilegious person, if no slanderer of his brethren, or reviler of his betters, can enter into the kingdom of heaven, (as it is certain they cannot until they repent,) then no man, which is certain of his salvation, can persuade himself, or be persuaded that he is a covetous or sacrilegious person, that he is a slanderer of his brethren, or a reviler of his betters; and hence the conclusion arising from the premises is inevitable, that albeit such men as presume of their election or salvation before their time, before they be throughly sanctified, do all that covetous or sacrilegious men do, be continual slanderers or malicious revilers of their brethren, yet it is impossible that they should suspect, much less condemn themselves of these crimes, until they correct their former errors, and rectify their misbelief or presumption of their immutable estate in grace. Yea their error, not being corrected, makes them confident in these wicked practices, and causes them to mistake hatred to men's persons, or envy to others' good parts, for zeal to religion; and stubbornness in schism and faction, for Christian charity or good affection unto truth. And if any man of better insight in the stratagems of Satan shall go about to detect their error, or convince them by strength of reason grounded upon scripture that their mispersuasions do branch into blasphemy, and can bring forth no better fruit than Pharisaical hypocrisy, yet they usually requite his pains as that young Spanish spark did the physician which had well nigh cured him of a desperate phrensy; no sooner had he brought him to know what

he was indeed—no more than a page, though to a great duke or grandee of Spain—but the youth, instead of a fee, or thankful acknowledgment, began to revile and curse the physician for bringing him out of a pleasant dream of golden mountains, much richer than the king of Spain had any: it seemed as a kind of hell unto him, to see himself to be but a page, who in his raving fits had taken upon him to create dukes and earls, and to exercise the acts of royal authority. Very much like him in Horace:

> Fuit haud ignobilis Argis,
> Qui se credebat miros audire tragœdos
> In vacuo lætus sessor plausorque theatro:..
> Hic ubi cognatorum opibus curisque refectus
> Expulit helleboro morbum bilemque meraco,
> Et redit ad sese, Pol, me occidistis, amici,
> Non servastis, ait, cui sic extorta voluptas
> Et demptus per vim mentis gratissimus error.
>
> Epp. II. ii. 128.

But with the originals of misbelief (besides what is said in our fifth book of Comments upon the Creed) in this particular, we shall have fitter occasion to meet hereafter: and the greater part of men amongst us (I am persuaded) offend more in unbelief than in misbelief.

Infidels of two sorts.

6. And by unbelief (lest we should be mistaken) we understand somewhat less than the lowest degree of infidelity. Now of infidels there be two degrees or ranks, *infideles contradictionis*, and *infideles puræ negationis:* he is an infidel in the former sense that contradicts or opposeth the truth of scriptures, especially concerning everlasting life and everlasting death; and such infidels, I presume, there are none amongst us: he is an infidel in the latter sense that doth not believe the truth of scriptures, or cannot give a reason of his faith; or one that neither thinks of heaven or hell; 521

and such infidels there be almost in every congregation. But an unbeliever a man may be, although in the general he believe whatsoever the scripture saith concerning the resurrection of the body, or life and death everlasting, unless withal he lay this his belief to heart, unless he have a true estimate as well of the reward proposed to good deeds as of the punishment proposed to evil doers.

It was a wise saying of one[1], that was not the wisest doctor in his time; *Tractare res humanas norunt plurimi, æstimare pauci:* "Many there be that have skill enough in human affairs, that want no wit to achieve the ends which they propose to themselves; and yet but a few which know how to esteem or prize the ends at which they aim aright." And of all our errors and defects there be but two general roots; the first, an overprizing of secular ends or contentments; the second, an undervaluing of matters heavenly, specially of life and death everlasting.

Two roots of errors.

The true reason why many who can discourse well of heavenly matters (and can give a reason of their belief sufficient to convince the gainsayers of the truth which they believe) are not so able to take or give the true estimate of the things believed, is muchwhat the same with that which philosophers assign, why young men are no fit auditors of moral philosophy, or why they prove not so good proficients in this study as in other arts and sciences. To learn the mathematics, as arithmetic or geometry, young men or children are as apt as men of mature age; and in natural philosophy they find no difficulty, save only want of experience, which is never attained unto in just and full measure without length of time, or competent number of years.

[1] Cardanus.

Howbeit in the former studies, though all their life-time were youth, men might attain to the same measure of experience in the same course of time or number of years that they could if all their life were mature age. But so it is not in moral philosophy: what is the reason? The philosopher tells us, 'It is because young men, or men whose affections are unsettled, can have no taste of moral goodness, or of the sweetness of true virtue:' and as his master before him had observed, *Omnis vita gustu quodam ducitur;* we must have a taste or relish of good or evil, or else we shall neither follow the one nor eschew the other with that constancy, with that life and courage, which is required to virtue or morality. We may do many good things which a good Christian ought to do, and yet not live a Christian life; as Herod did (Mark vi. 20.), who feared and observed St. John Baptist as a holy just man, and heard him gladly, and when he heard him did many things, yet cut off his head.

Unbelief of this article cause of unchristian careless life.

7. To lead a Christian life is more than to be a mere moral man, although it always includes morality in it; and whatsoever is required to a moral life, that and more is necessarily required to a Christian and godly life. 'And seeing the framing of a true Christian life depends very much upon the true belief of this article of everlasting life and everlasting death, the most effectual method which God's ambassadors can use to this end must be, to exhibit a true taste or relish of the goodness contained in the one, and of the evil comprised in the other.' And this is the method which, by God's assistance, I mean to follow:

First, to set down directions whence or by what means we may take a taste or relish (without danger to our souls) of everlasting death.

And secondly, how the like taste or relish may be

had of everlasting life; or at the least how we may frame unto ourselves a true (though a short) measure, by which we may, by diligent meditation, take a better estimate of both than most men do.

522 I will begin with the means how to estimate everlasting death, because it is much easier to have some taste or relish of it than of everlasting life.

There is no evil which a man in this life doth suffer, no pain or grief, but may in some sort serve a diligent meditator to take a view or estimate of the horrors of the second death. But always the greater the evil is, which we have suffered or have experience of, the more fit measure it is for calculating the endless miseries of the second death. And the very cogitation or remembrance of such particular evils as we have actually suffered or have experience of, will be more effectual to withdraw us from those means or practices which procure them, than the representation or contemplation of evils in their nature far greater, but of which we have had no taste or experience.

8. A memorable experiment in this kind we have recorded by Justin, (and other good writers,) of those Scythians which had waged war so long in Asia that their wives, growing weary of their absence, did marry with their slaves or bondmen; and their slaves, being willing to defend the possessions which they had usurped, took arms against their masters at their return; but were quickly routed without stroke of sword or dint of lance, or other usual weapon of war. Instead of these, their masters charged them on horseback with whips in their hands, with success, according to their own forecast or expectation. Of hurts or wounds made by sword or lance, as they wisely did forecast, their slaves had formerly had no experience; they never had felt the smart or grief of

either; but their backs had been accustomed to the scourge or lash, and the very sight of these weapons, reviving the memory of their former smart, more affrighted them on a sudden than any terror of war besides could have done. To have tried their courage or fortunes, either by push of pike or dint of sword, they would have been more forward than wiser men, *dulce bellum inexpertis.* Want of experience in this kind would have made them, for the first brunt at least, more insolent and foolhardy; whereas the very sight and noise of the whip, whereof they had so often tasted, did presently daunt them, and make them seek their security from it by confused flight. The historical truth of this relation, and good success of their stratagem, is sealed unto us in the public coin of that country, whose stamp to this day is a man on horseback with a whip in his hand.

9. It would be a great comfort to us, that are God's ambassadors, if we could but persuade men to be as afraid to wrong or deface the monuments of men deceased, as the modern Turks are to offer the least indignity unto ordinary papers scattered in the streets; or to be as careful in preserving the goods of the church, as these infidels are to preserve the least scrap of paper that would otherwise perish.

What is the reason why they are so careful in these toys, and we so negligent in matters of such moment, and the like?

They have a tradition, (whether received from Mahomet himself, or from his successors their mufties, I know not, but a tradition they have,) which they strongly believe, that before they can enter into such a heaven as they dream of, they must pass over a long iron grate red hot, without any other fence to save their naked feet from scorching, save only so much

paper as they shall preserve from perishing. Now of the pains or tortures which the violent heat of iron produceth in naked bodies, they have a kind of feeling or experience. The conceit or notion of this pain is fresh and lively, and works more strongly upon their affections than the dread of hell fire doth upon many
523 Christians, albeit there is no Christian which doth not believe the fire of hell to be everlasting; whereas the Turk thinks this his supposed purgatory to be but temporary, and between pains temporary and pains everlasting there is no proportion. How then comes it to pass that this superstitious fear of pains but temporary should so far exceed our true fear or belief of pains uncessant and everlasting? Many which truly believe there is a hell, whose fire never goeth out, yet conceive this fire to be an immaterial fire, a fire of whose heat or violence they have no sense or feeling in this life, a fire altogether unknown unto them: and as no man much desireth that good which he knoweth not, how great soever it be; so no man much feareth that evil whereof he hath no sense or feeling, no experimental knowledge whereby to measure the greatness of it, but only believes it confusedly or in gross; and hence it is that the acknowledgment or belief of such a fire, how great soever it may seem to be in the general abstract conceit, is but like a spacious mathematical body, which hath neither weight nor motion, which can produce no real effects in the soul or affections of man. For this reason I have always held it a fruitless pains or a needless curiosity to dispute the question, whether the fire of hell be a material fire or no, that is, such a fire as may be felt by bodily senses, seeing most men conceive no otherwise of things immaterial or spiritual than as of abstract notions, or of mathematical magnitudes. As the determination of

this question (were it possible in this life to be determined) would be fruitless, so the chief reason which some have brought to prove the negative, to wit, that it is not a material fire, is of no force in true philosophy, much less in divinity.

10. Their chief reason is this; That if hell fire were a material or bodily fire, it could not immediately work upon the soul, which is an immaterial or spiritual substance. But let them tell us how it is possible that the soul of man, which is an immortal substance, should be truly wedded to the body or material substance, and I shall as easily answer them, that it is as possible for the same soul to be as really wrought upon by a material fire. As possible it is for material fire to propagate death without end to both body and soul, as it is for the immaterial or immortal soul to communicate life without end to the material substance of the body. For the bodies of the damned shall never cease to be material substances, and they shall live to everlasting pains, by a life communicated unto them from their immaterial and immortal souls. And as the bodies do live continually, by reason of their continual union with their living immaterial souls; so the soul may die the second death continually, by its union with or imprisonment in material but everlasting fire. Or if any man be of opinion that hell fire is no material fire, or hath no resemblance of that fire which we see and know, yet let him believe that it is a great deal worse, and that the greatest torture which in this life can come by fire is, though a true, yet but an imperfect scantling of the torments of the life to come, and the danger will be less.

Of this opinion were the ancients, and this conceit or notion of hell fire did in some bring forth very good effects. So Eusebius, in his fifth book and first

The story of Biblis.

chapter of his Ecclesiastical Story, tells of one Biblis, a woman which had professed Christianity, but was so daunted with the cruel persecutions of Christians, that she renounced her profession, and was brought unto the place where the Christians were executed, with purpose to withdraw others from constancy in their profession by her expected blasphemy against Christ, and reproachful aspersions upon Christians. But the very sight of those flames wherein the martyrs
524 were tortured did throughly awake her out of her former slumber; her very fear, or rather conceit of such torments, which they for the time suffered, did afford her a measure or scantling to calculate the incomparable torments of hell fire, which, being now awaked, she began to bethink herself that she must suffer them without hope of release, if she should deny Christ or renounce her calling; and thus expelling the lesser fear by the greater, she resolutely professed herself to be a true Christian in heart, and so contrary to the expectation of the persecutors and her own former resolution, increased the number of the glorious martyrs, and encouraged others after her to endure the cross.

11. But albeit the scripture usually describes the horror of the second death by a fire which never goeth out, or by a lake of fire and brimstone; and so describes it, either because that fire is of such nature and quality as these descriptions literally and without metaphor import, or because these are the most obvious and most conspicuous representations of the pains and horrors of hell, which flesh and blood are generally most acquainted with, and most afraid of; yet many other branches of pains and tortures there be, besides those which fire of what kind soever can inflict; and of these several pains most men respectively may have

as true a relish or sensible representation as they can have of hell fire. You have read before, that as there is in this life *a body of sin*[m], which hath as many members as there be several senses or several faculties of the soul; so there is a body of the second death, every way proportionable to the body of sin. The extremity or deadliness of all the pains, discontents, or grievances which are incident to any bodily sense or faculty of the soul in this life are contained either *formaliter*, that is, as we say, in kind, in the body of the second death; or *eminenter*, that is, either in a worse kind, or in a greater measure, than in this life they could be endured, though but for a minute; and yet must be endured everlastingly in the life to come, by all such as in this life do not mortify the *whole body of sin*, or have it not mortified in them.

Motives from meditation of eternal death, according to general or more particular tastes of it.

Now as of bodily medicines some be general, or, as physicians call them, *catholica*, such as equally respect the whole body; others topical, that is, such as are framed to some special part or member; so likewise of the medicines or receipts, which the meditation upon this article of everlasting death affords; some are general, and indifferently respect every spiritual disease; and such are the consideration of *the worm which never dieth*, and of *the fire which never goeth out*. Others there be which in special respect particular diseases of the soul, and are to be applied, as time and occasions require, unto the several members or affections of *the old man*. Some of these particular medicines are more effectual to cure lust or amorousness, others more effectual to quell gluttony or drunkenness, others to take down pride or vanity. That which in respect of one man, or his special disease, is less effectual, may be more effectual and more sove-

[m] See chapter 20. [p. 373 of this volume.]

reign in respect of another. That which is in itself of less efficacy comparatively, may make deeper impression, and work more strongly upon some man's peculiar disposition, than the greatest and most terrible object that can be presented to his sense or to his belief.

Parisiensis his story.

12. Parisiensis (a learned and judicious divine in his time) tells us of a gentleman of his special acquaintance which had long warred with *the old man*, or *body of sin*, and taken the advice of his confessors or spiritual physicians for obtaining the victory over the flesh, yet found himself too weak to encounter with lust or amorousness, an affection which still received strength or courage from the sight of beauty; until at length he procured a dead scull of one of the most beautiful creatures which his eyes had beheld, and by using this relic of the first death as a memorandum for representation of the second, he was throughly cured of this disease, which, without cure, would have brought that death upon him. The same cure or medicine every man that is subject to the like disease cannot hope for, may not attempt; but every one that truly believes this article of everlasting death, may have a peculiar medicine more effectual to this purpose. Though every one cannot have a skeleton or death's head to look upon with his bodily eyes, yet *faith* (as the apostle speaks) being *the evidence of things not seen*, every one, that hath the eyes of his mind enlightened with the least beam of true faith, may see and consider, that albeit there be no dead sculls or skeletons in hell, yet the very sight or presence of living creatures there, of such as were their most amiable and pleasant consorts in this life, shall be more loathsome than any spectacle, than any relics of the first death which the grave or charnel-house can afford them. And unto this peculiar disease,

or to the mortification of this particular member of the old man, no meditation or consideration of any branch of the second death can be more powerful, than the cogitation of the ghastliness of that place and of its inhabitants.

13. I have read of a young gallant which came upon secular respects, as upon affinity or old acquaintance, to visit his friend, being of a quite contrary disposition, one of a strict and austere life, whether upon choice or necessity I now remember not: but after a long and profane discourse of the gallant, which the other would not much interrupt, as well knowing that profaneness, *ægrescit medendo*, grows always more desperate by unseasonable contradiction or importunate persuasions. However, at the close, or leave-taking, instead of a compliment, this religious man requested the profane gallant to carry this short saying in his memory for his sake—

Putredo et vermis operimentum eorum—

That there was a hell prepared for profane men, and that worms and rottenness should be to them for a covering instead of clothing. And this brief receipt wrought more effectually with him than if the general terrors of hell had been rung into his ears thrice a week in a large discourse, or presented to his eyes in a picture of them. And the reason why this brief memorandum wrought so with him was, because one special branch of his sensuality was his excessive or immoderate delight in sweet perfumes and soft raiment.

A seasonable lesson collected out of Job xxi. Isa. xiv. Ecclus. xix.

14. To instance in more particulars of this kind would be long and tedious; the general rule for all is brief. There is no bodily sense or faculty which is capable of or accustomed to excessive pleasures or extraordinary carnal contentments, which doth not

thereby become as capable of the contrary pain or discontentment:

> Quem res plus nimio delectavere secundæ,
> Mutatæ quatient. Hor. Epp. I. x. 30.

The greater a man's delight hath been in any worldly prosperity, the greater will his grief or disconsolation be when the opposite branch of adversity falls upon him. Man by natural constitution, as the philosopher observes, is more sensible of pain than of pleasure; matter of pleasure or contentment little moves us, unless it be in some excess or quantity more than ordinary. But of the least degree of pain, or smallest portion of matter of discontent, we are most sensible. Hence was that saying of the poet,

> ——— nocet empta dolore voluptas.
> Hor. Epp. I. ii. 55.

526 If every dram of pleasure were to be purchased with the like quantity of pain especially incident to the same sense or faculty, there is no man so sensual or voluptuous but would be quickly weary of his course of life. If such as are misled by the curiosity or vanity of the eye, might have free choice of all the most pleasant spectacles which this sense or other faculties which receive contentment by it could wish to look upon for a whole day together, all this variety could not recompense one hour of such torture as Regulus suffered by this sense alone. If such as are misled by the sense of taste might have Dives's fare, or the most exquisite meats and drinks which this present world affords, all this variety could not countervail the extremity of hunger and thirst for one week. And yet that maxim of the wise man, *in quo quisque peccat, in eo punietur*, "in that wherein a man most sins, by the same he shall be punished," holds most true in the

life to come, and is most exactly verified in the senses or instruments of unlawful pleasures.

The rule of retaliation, that is, of suiting punishments to the nature and quality of sins committed, which is often manifested in this life in respect of grosser or outcrying sins, shall be most strictly observed when God shall finally render to every man according to all his ways. He that hath offended most by the vanity of the eye [n], shall be especially punished in the eye; he that hath specially offended in the sense of touch or taste, shall be most tormented in the instruments of the same senses: and so it shall be in every other particular sense or faculty wherein sin hath lodged or exercised his dominion. The hint of this general rule or doctrine is given unto us by our Saviour in the parable of the rich glutton: the principal crime wherewith he is expressly taxed was his too much pampering of the sense of taste, without compassion of his poor brother, whom he suffered to die for hunger. And the only punishment which is expressed by our Saviour is the scorching heat of his tongue, which is the instrument of taste, and his unquenchable thirst, without so much hope of comfort as a drop of cold water could afford him, though this comfort were earnestly begged at the hands, or rather at the finger of Abraham, who in his lifetime had been open-handed unto the poor, a man full of bounty, mercy, and pity. But these are works which follow such as practise them here on earth into heaven; they extend not themselves unto such as are shut up in that everlasting prison which is under the earth.

[n] Rev. xviii. 5, 6, 7.

CHAP. XXIV.

ROMANS VI. 23.

The wages of sin is death: but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The body of death being proportioned to the body of sin, Christian meditation must apply part to part, but by rule and in season.—The dregs or relics of sin be the sting of conscience, and this is a prognostic of the worm of conscience, which is chief part of the second death.—Directions how to make right use of the fear of the second death, without falling into despair; and of the hope of life eternal, without mounting into presumption: viz. *Beware,* 1. *of immature persuasions of certainty in salvation;* 2. *of this opinion, that all men be at all times either in the estate of the elect or reprobates;* 3. *of the irrespective decree of*
527 *absolute reprobation.—The use of the taste of death and pleasures: the Turkish use of both.—How Christians may get a relish of joy eternal: by peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, and works of righteousness; affliction useful to that purpose.*

1. SEEING the body of the second death is in every part proportionable to the body of sin, which not mortified doth procure it; the art of meditation upon the one branch of this great article (viz. everlasting death) must be thus assisted or deduced:

Meditations of the second death to be fitted to several parts of the body of sin, for the mortifying of it.

First, By right fitting or suiting the several members or branches of the second death unto the several members of the body of sin. The force or efficacy of this medicine depends especially upon the right application of it: and the right application consists in counterpoising our hopes or desires of unlawful pleasures with the just fear of suitable evils. Now as the fear of those evils, whereof we have a distinct or comprehensive notion, hath more weight or force upon our

affections than the fear of evils far greater in themselves, but of which we have only an indistinct, confused, or general notion; (such as a man blind from his birth may have of colours, which in the general he knows to be sensible qualities, but what kind of qualities in the particular he cannot know;) so of those evils whereof we have a specifical or distinct notion, those have the greatest sway upon our several corrupt affections, which are most directly contrary to our particular delights or pleasures which accompany the exercise or motions of the same affections. So as the chief, if not the only means to mortify the several members of *the old man* or *body of sin*, is to plant the fear of those particular evils in the same sense or faculty by whose peculiar delights or pleasures we find ourselves to be most usually withdrawn from the ways of life. For the fear of any evil distinctly known, though in itself more weighty, doth not so directly or fully countersway any delight or pleasure, unless it be seated in the same particular subject with it, and move upon the same centre. Curiosity of the eye is not so easily tamed with any other fear as with fear of blindness. Lust, or delight in the pleasures of the flesh, is not so forcibly restrained by any other fear as by fear of some loathsome disease, or grievous pain incident to the instruments or organs of such pleasures. Pride and ambition stand not in so much awe of any other punishment as of shame, disgrace, or disrespect.

2. But how good soever the medicine be, it is either dangerous or unuseful, unless it be applied in due season. The same physic hath contrary effects upon a full and a fasting stomach. And as a great part of the art of husbandry consists in the observation of times and seasons wherein to sow or plant, so a great

part of this divine art of meditation depends upon our knowledge or observance of opportunities best fitting the plantation of this fear of particular evils, which must countersway our inclinations to particular pleasures. This must be attempted (as we say) in cold blood, and in the calm of our affections, or in the absence of strong temptations, which scarce admit of any other medicine or restraint, save only flying to the force of prayer. It was a wise caveat of an heathen[o], that as often as we call those pleasures or delights of the body or sense, whereof we have had any former experience, to mind, we should not look upon them as they did present themselves, or came towards us, for their face or countenance is pleasant and enticing; but if we diligently observe them in their passage from us, they are ugly and loathsome, and always leave their
528 sting behind them. And as the several delightful objects of every particular outward sense meet in the internal common sense or fantasy, so the dregs or relics which every unlawful pleasure at its departure leaves in the sense or faculty wherein it harboured, do all concur to make up the sting of conscience; and the sting of conscience (unless we wittingly stifle the working of it) doth give the truest representation of the second death, and makes the deepest impression of hell pains that in this life can generally be had.

3. There is no man (unless he be given over by God to a reprobate sense) whose heart will not smite him either in the consciousness of grosser sins, unto which he hath in a lower degree been accustomed, or of usual sins, though for the quality not so gross. Now if men would suffer their cogitations to reflect upon the regrettings which always accompany the

[o] Aristotle.

accomplishments of unlawful desires, (as frequently and seriously as they in a manner impel them to reflect upon those enticing objects which inflame their breasts with such desires,) these cogitations would awake the natural sting of conscience, and this being awakened or quickened, would not suffer them to sleep any longer in their sins; for the smart or feeling of the sting of conscience is as sensible and lively a prognostic of the worm which never dieth, (which is the chief part of the second death,) as heaviness of spirit or grudgings are of fevers or other diseases, which, without preventing physic or diet, do always follow them.

4. But this prognostic of the second death, or this fear of hell pains, (which the sting of conscience always exhibits,) must be warily taken, and weighed with judgment. The right observance of them (as every other good quality or habit) is beset with two contrary extremes; the one in defect, the other in excess. The defect is carelessness, the excess despair, or too much dejection of mind.

The intimations or prognostics which the sting of conscience exhibits of death spiritual, are often mistaken for the effects of bodily melancholy, and the best medicine for melancholy is pleasant society or mirth [p]. Out of this mistaking, most men prevent that compassion which is due to their own souls, after such a manner as Jewish parents did prevent their natural pity towards their children, when they sacrificed them unto Moloch, by filling their ears with the loud sound of wind instruments, lest the shrieks of the infants, (whom they enclosed in an image of hot glowing brass,) by entering in at their ears, might move their Jewish hearts to pity. And most men, lest they should

[p] See chap. x. §. 9, 10. [vol. x. p. 156, &c.]

be stung with grief of spirit or conscience, seek to stifle their first murmurings and repinings either with unhallowed or unseasonable mirth.

Others, by seeking to avoid this common extreme, often fall into the contrary, which is of the two the worse; to wit, despair, or too much dejection of spirit.

That which the heathen observed of grief in general is most true of this particular, the grief of a wounded spirit; *Dolori si fræna remittas, nulla materia non est maxima:* "If we let loose the reins to grief or sorrow, the least matter or occasion of either will be more weighty than we can well bear." Man's unbridled fancy is as a multiplying glass, which represents every thing, as well matter of sorrow as of pleasure, in a far greater quantity than it really hath. And unless our cogitations or sad remembrances of sins past be moderated with judgment and discretion, they will appear to our fancies like Cain's transgression, greater than can be forgiven, or than we can hope that the God of mercy will forgive. For holding the right mean betwixt these extremes, carelessness and despair, there is no means so effectual as to be rightly instructed in the
529 hope of everlasting life, and fear of everlasting death. Immature or unripe hopes of the one engendereth carelessness or presumption, so doth erroneous fear of the other bring forth despair.

Avoid here the presumptuous persuasion of certain salvation, and the conceit of absolute reprobation.

He that is persuaded that every one always is in the estate of the elect or of the reprobate, cannot avoid the one or other extreme; and the only remedy to prevent despair, or being swallowed up with grief, either in the consciousness of grosser sins lately committed, or whiles we reflect upon sins past, is to purge ourselves of that erroneous opinion concerning absolute reprobation, or irreversible ordination to death before

we were born, or from the time of our second birth by baptism.

5. To purge our brain or fancy of this opinion, let us take the form and tenor of the final sentence into consideration[q], which we may do without digression or diversion. Both branches of this sentence we have Matt. xxv.; the first branch, ver. 34: *Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world;* he doth not say *before all worlds;* though this in a good sense is true, most true, if we speak of God's design or act; for all his acts or designs are as he is, eternal, without beginning; so are not the things designed or enacted by him, they take their beginning in time, or with time. The kingdom prepared for God's people was prepared when the world was made, not before; so good and gracious was our God, that he did not make man or angel until he had prepared a place convenient for them: take them as they were his creatures, or workmanship, and they were all ordained to a life of bliss. Paradise was made for man, and, it may be, after man was made; but the heaven of heavens was prepared for man before he was made, and made for the angels, if not before they were made, yet when they were made. But the sentence of death, ver. 41, runs in other tenor; *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire:* he doth not say *prepared for you* from the foundation of the world, but *prepared for the devil and his angels.* Those immortal spirits which now are devils were sometime angels: God made them so; they made themselves devils. Now hell fire was not prepared for them whilst they were

Purge our brains of the erroneous opinion of the irrespective decree.

[q] See book x. chapp. 37, 51. [vol. ix. p. 296 and p. 550.]

angels, not from the foundation of the world, but from the time wherein of angels they became devils. Nor are men at all ordained to it, until of men they become Satan's angels. And as Satan and his angels (the spirits which fell with him) continue the selfsame individual substances which they were when God first created them, yet are no way the same, but quite contrary, for quality and disposition; so the place whereto they are confined may be for substance, space, and dimension the same it was at the first creation, but not the same for quality; it became a prison or place of torment when Satan and other spirits, which fell with him, of angels made themselves devils. Satan (as some think) brought that fire wherein he and his angels shall be tormented into the bowels of the earth when *he fell like lightning from heaven.* However, if the angels had not sinned, there had been no hell, no tormenting fire; and unless men become the devil's angels, they shall not be cast into hell fire. God doth not ordain men to be Satan's angels, but men continuing his sons or servants, God ordains them to take their portion with him.

So that if we remove the opinion of absolute reprobation, or of irreversible ordination of men's persons unto death before they were baptized or born; or if men would be confirmed in faith, that no such sentence or decree is gone out against them whilst they have either will, desire, or opportunity to call upon God
530 through Jesus Christ for remission of sins, whether by confession of them, or by absolution from them upon such confession, or by receiving the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, no danger can accrue from the frequent meditation of everlasting death, or from such representations of the horrors of it, as the often reflecting upon our sins past, and the working of the

Meditations, or a taste of eternal death here,

sting of conscience, upon such reflections, will present unto us.

fits us better for a taste of eternal life hereafter.

6. Another excellent use, and that a positive one, there is of these meditations. For no man ordinarily can have a true taste or relish of eternal life but he which hath had some taste or grudging of everlasting death. The sense or taste or overture of the second death doth make the least relish of the second resurrection unto life to seem more sweet and pleasant. Now it is the relish or secret intimation of celestial joys which must animate and encourage us to undertake all the dangers or discontents wherewith the way unto the heavenly Canaan (the land of promise and of our rest) is beset. The most forcible reasons which the divinest orator can use, or the best words wherewith he can apparel his reasons or persuasions, are but vain, unless he can with them or by them instil this secret taste or relish into men's souls. All the descriptions which the leaders of the Gauls could make of the pleasures or commodities of Italy; all the news or reports which they could devise or cause to be made in their public meetings, as it were upon our Royal Exchange, could not so much animate their followers to adventure upon the strait and difficult passages over the Alps, as did the taste of the Italian grape. And that which did especially aggravate the Israelites' dastardy for not undertaking that sacred war whereunto God had called them against the Canaanites, the Amorites, and the Hittites, &c., was the sight of those grapes which such as were sent to discover that good land had brought from Eschol. Their unusual greatness, which all the host might have seen, and their extraordinary relish, which many did or might have tasted, was a pledge or assurance of the truth of God's promises concerning the fertility or pleasantness of

that land. For as we say *ex ungue leonem*, the terror of the lion which we never saw may be taken from his paw; or as Pythagoras did take the just quantity of Hercules' body by the print of his foot; so might the Israelites have taken the true estimate of the land of Canaan from the unusual quality and extraordinary quantity of that bunch of grapes which their mutinous spies or intelligencers could not deny to be the native fruit of that soil. But of the Israelites' disobedience and dastardy, and what both these and the slanderous reports which their spies or intelligencers did raise of that good land mystically import, we shall take occasion, if God permit, hereafter to handle.

7. Such a pledge as these Israelites had of God's promises concerning the land of Canaan, we may have and must have of the pleasures of the celestial Canaan, before we become valorous in our undertakings for it. And if we once attain to a true taste or relish of its goodness, the least portion of it will serve as a true measure to notify the incomparable excess of those joys, in comparison of any earthly pleasures or annoyances, the one or other of which, and nothing besides them, can occasion our diversion from the ways which lead unto them.

The force which the taste of experienced pleasures hath upon men's souls.

The force or efficacy which experienced pleasures or contentments have upon men's souls or affections, Mahomet and his successors too well foresaw, and so by a known representation of a counterfeit heaven, and by a real and experienced taste of imaginary or feigned pleasures in the life to come, did make their
531 followers more zealous and confident in propagating their empire and religion, than either Christian preachers or magistrates can make their Christian people. The obedience of Turkish children to their parents, of their greatest nobles to their sovereign, of their sol-

diers to their commanders, of inferior commanders to their superiors or generals, far exceeds any obedience which we Christians usually perform to our superiors, in what kind soever. One erroneous principle notwithstanding they have—That all things are so decreed by God as nothing can fall out otherwise than it doth [r]: and from this prejudicate conceit, when opportunity suggests fair hopes unto the son of obtaining his father's crown, they account it no sin, but a religious act, for the son to depose the father, as presuming it is God's will thus to have it, whensoever he offers opportunity. But when there is no hope to gain a crown by rebellion, no intimation given by the signs of the time, that God will prosper their attempts against their superiors, there is no subject in any Christian kingdom that will accept the greatest dignity whereto his sovereign lord can advance him, with such loyal respect and submission, as the sons or grand-children of their emperors will embrace the sentence of death, though no way deserved, only in obedience to his designs and pleasure. There is no malefactor amongst us, though openly convicted of capital crimes, that will submit himself to the sentence of the law with that cheerfulness of mind, or unregretting affections, as their inferior commanders or common soldiers will surrender their lives into their superiors' hands, be the service whereunto they appoint them never so dreadful or desperate.

8. Now the great motives by which Turkish priests or their magistrates work this absolute submission and complete obedience in inferiors, is, either fear of hell or torments after this life, in case they shall disobey, or hopes of heaven, if they continue loyal and obedient; and yet the hell which they fear is no way so terrible

[r] See vol. ix. p. 366.

as that hell with whose torments we daily threaten the disobedient: their hopes of heaven are nothing so glorious as those hopes which God promiseth, and we profess we believe them to be the reward of our obedience to our God, to our prince, and to his just laws, whether ecclesiastic or civil. Whence then doth this great difference or odds arise between their obedience and ours? From no other root than this: They propose unto their followers such an heaven, such contentments after this life, as they may have a true taste or relish of in this life, by whose multiplication the incomparable excess of future contentments in respect of present may by ordinary capacities be easily taken. There is no delight or pleasure which men in this world can take in the days of plenty, security, and peace, no pleasures of the outward senses of touch or taste, which they do not hope to enjoy in far greater measure in heaven, without annoyance, interruption, or disturbance, than their emperor or grand seignior in this life can do. The meanest amongst them persuades himself he shall have more consorts or concubines than their luxurious emperors have, all more beautiful than any earthly creatures can be. There is no delight, again, in war, or feats of arms, which their common soldiers hope not to enjoy, without danger or defatigation of their bodies, in far greater measure than the greatest commanders or generals of their armies do. And being thus possessed with this twofold persuasion, first, that obedience to superiors doth merit heaven; secondly, that the joys of heaven are for nature and quality the same with such earthly pleasures and contentments which they have tasted, but infinitely exceed them for quantity and duration; to persuade them to lay down this life in hope of
532 attaining the life to come, by obedience to their

emperors, or in love to their religion, is a matter of no greater difficulty, than to induce a merchant to lay out an hundred pounds sterling in his own country, upon such assurance as this world affords, to receive ten thousand pounds, either in the same coin or in valuable commodities, in another country, by way of return, or bill of exchange.

9. But as for us Christians, albeit our hopes of heaven be far more glorious than theirs can be; albeit our faith, which is the ground of our hopes, be most firm and sound, (whereas their belief of such a heaven as they hope for, is but grounded upon the sand;) yet, inasmuch as the most part of Christians have no distinct conceit or notion of the heavenly joys which they hope for, but believe them only in general or in gross to be exceeding great, their faith is in a manner but dead, their hopes have no operations upon their affections, they do not sway them to constancy in any honourable adventures or undertakings for the heavenly Canaan. We that be God's ambassadors may spend our spirits and our breaths, and be answered only with religion consisting in words, or with a zeal of hearing God's word, not of doing it. The case of most hearers is muchwhat like to the case of a man extremely sick, and oppressed with distempered humours. There is no man so sick (unless he be possessed with deep melancholy or a phrensy,) but will acknowledge in the general that such a diet as his physician prescribes him is good; that such meats as he seeth men in health to feed upon with delight are pleasant, and useful for preserving health. But press him to make his words good by his practice in particular, and you shall find a real contradiction; those meats which out of his former experience he acknowledgeth to be sweet and pleasant, are to him in this distemper and indis-

position of body, bitter and abominable. The best diet which the physician can prescribe him, is nothing so welcome to him as those meats and drinks which the distempered humour longeth after. And albeit you urge him with the authority of Hippocrates, Galen, or other famous professors of physic, yet you shall not persuade him to follow their counsel, until he have in some measure recovered his taste; and the only means to recover it must be by the removing the noxious humour wherewith it is oppressed. Yet such as are bodily sick have had some taste and experience of wholesome food in the time of their health; for bodily health ordinarily goes before bodily sickness. But the spiritual diseases of our consciences have precedency of spiritual health; we all are soul-sick from our birth, even in the womb. And for this reason it is, that to work a longing in us after a spiritual health, or to bring us in love with true spiritual food, is a matter of far greater difficulty than to bring a man bodily sick unto a liking of wholesome bodily food. We may persuade men in the general that the joys of heaven infinitely exceed all the pleasures of this life; and thus far they will easily believe us; but without some taste or relish of them no man will set his heart to seek after them.

The taste or true relish of eternal joys, how gained.

10. For us to give men, or men to take a true relish of them, it is not (ordinarily) possible, until our hearts and consciences be in some good measure disburdened of fleshly lusts, of worldly desires, or freed from minding earthly matters. The ordinary physic which God doth use in working this first cure is some cross, affliction, or chastisement. Every cross or branch of affliction, which in this life can befall us, is in the intention of God's providence as a peculiar medicine to purge our souls of some one vain delight or other.

Now if we would seriously ruminate upon the particular afflictions which befall us, or suffer the sting of conscience to have its work whensoever our hearts do smite us; this would be a good preparation for the recovery of our spiritual taste; without whose recovery we cannot be purified according to the purification of the sanctuary. The use of affliction to that purpose. 533

But, say the Lord hath laid no cross, no affliction upon us, yet this is a diet so necessary for the soul, that every one, in case the Lord do not, must afflict his own soul; that is, he must sometimes humble himself in fasting and prayer; for this, in the language of Canaan, is *to afflict the soul:* without such exercise voluntarily undertaken, (not as meritorious or profitable in themselves, but as useful for enjoying of ourselves, and the gaining of free and retired thoughts,) our spiritual taste is not usually recoverable, or, being in some measure recovered, cannot be preserved.

But you will ask, Wherein doth this spiritual taste consist? what is the object of it? or that which answers unto it, as bodily food doth unto bodily taste? or what is the best diet for recovering of it?

This you are to learn from our apostle, Rom. xiv. 17, *The kingdom of God is not meat and drink;* it neither consists in our use or abstinence from these. What is it then? ***Righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.*** These words (if you mark them) are well placed: first, *righteousness;* then, *peace;* lastly, *joy in the Holy Ghost.* For, as the prophet had said long before, *opus justitiæ pax;* peace, the peace of conscience towards God, towards men, and with our own souls and affections, is the resultance or work of righteousness, as it is opposed unto iniquity. For *there is no peace to the wicked, saith my God,* Isai. lvii. 21. Joy there may be without this peace or serenity of That taste is the peace of conscience and joy in the Holy Ghost, to which the working of righteousness is necessary.

conscience; but no *joy in the Holy Ghost* without it. Peace of conscience is as the first taste or smell of eternal rest; the first sign or symptom of spiritual health restored. *Joy in the Holy Ghost* is to the soul, as that cheerfulness or liveliness which accompanieth perfect health is unto the body. Righteousness or its works are as the food or diet by which this spiritual health and liveliness of the soul is procured.

11. So then he that desires to have a true taste of the heavenly gift, or of the powers of the life to come, must inure himself to the works of righteousness, of that universal righteousness whose practice is commended unto us in the affirmative and positive precepts of the first and second table. It is not enough to abstain from the evil works prohibited in the negative precepts of both tables. This abstinence is as the matter or privation of that true righteousness whereof peace is the work or fruit. Howbeit even this inchoative righteousness, or imperfect embryon of it, is seldom or never framed and conceived without some chastisement or correction; which are as gentle remembrancers of the horrors of the second death. Nor is this inchoative or privative righteousness always framed by chastisements or such remembrances, but by patient suffering of them, or by embracing them as so many tokens or pledges of our heavenly Father's providence and loving care over us. Hence saith our apostle, Heb. xii. 7, *If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons; for what son is he whom the Father chasteneth not?* Surely no gracious or beloved son: so the same apostle had said, ver. 6, *Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.* Sons then he hath whom he doth not receive, because they will not endure chastisement or receive correction from him with

The work of righteousness universal obedience.

The use of affliction or chastisement to that purpose.

submission and patience. These he gives over as degenerate and lost sons. And there is not a more fearful sign of God's displeasure toward men, than his longsuffering of them without chastisement. *If ye be without chastisement,* (saith the apostle, Heb. xii. 8,) *whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons:* but if all be partakers of it, how can any be without it? Yes, they are without chastisement which 534
will not patiently suffer it, which will not embrace it, as a pledge of their heavenly Father's love; and these are *bastards.* What is that? A bastard is a son, but (in the language of men) unlawfully begotten. Hath God any such sons or children? God forbid! All are his sons, all are his children by right of creation, and by right of redemption; and both these are lawful titles of fatherhood and dominion over us. Bastards then they are who refuse chastisement, in this sense only, that they are stubborn and disobedient, or misaffected towards the Father of mankind; they imagine him not to be so kind and loving to all his sons, not to themselves in particular, as earthly parents are to their lawfully begotten children. This is that imputation which our apostle seeks to avert from God, or rather that suspicion which he seeks to remove from all who call him their Father, and that by an argument, as the schools speak, *a fortiore,* ver. 9, 10: *Furthermore we have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection unto the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure;* (sometime perhaps without actual intendment or express foresight of any good unto us;) *but he,* to wit, our heavenly Father, *for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness.*

12. The end of his chastisement is always this;

that we may serve him in righteousness, and have our fruit unto holiness, whose end is everlasting life. And one chief part of our righteousness consists in the patient submission of ourselves unto his chastisements.

The first part of righteousness, in respect of what law soever, is, not to transgress the law.

The second is, to submit ourselves unto the penalty which the law inflicts, in case we transgress it.

To plead the former part of this righteousness, in respect of God's law, we cannot; to perform the second part of it we are bound, upon pain of losing our right of sons. The penalty of disobedience to it, or refusal of chastisements in this life, is the woful estate of bastards, or of sons disinherited.

The sum of that which hath been said concerning our meditation of the second death (especially as this meditation is a preparative to the works of righteousness or of holiness) is excellently comprised by our apostle, Heb. xii. 11: *Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless afterwards it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby.* The burnt child, as we say, dreads the fire; and he is more than a child, a very infant, or witless child, which will not avoid the scorching flames of it by the experience which he hath of its heat. Now there is no chastisement, no correction that is grievous for the present, but ought to be as a gentle remembrancer unto us of hell pains, or such a fair caveat for avoiding them, as the experienced heat of visible and known fire (unto him that stands near it) is of the harms which it would procure, if we should be cast into it. And if we would make this or the like use of all the crosses and afflictions, of all the bodily pains and grievances, of all the perplexities of mind or conscience which in this life

we suffer, we should be more careful than we are to avoid the temptations by which Satan seeks to draw us into that everlasting fire which is prepared for him and his angels. This abstinence from evil is the first branch of our patience in affliction; the second is the fruit of righteousness.

But I suppose the reader will desire a further taste, first, of the peace of conscience; secondly, of that joy 535
in the Holy Ghost wherein the kingdom of heaven consists. And the explication of these two great points follows in the next chapter.

In the interim, the best use which can be made of the doctrine hitherto delivered, is made unto our hands by our apostle himself, Heb. xii. 12—17: *Wherefore lift up the hands which hang down, and the feeble knees; and make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way; but let it rather be healed. Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord: looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby many be defiled; lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears.*

CHAP. XXV.

ROMANS VI. 22.

But now——ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life, &c.

The coldness of our hope of life eternal causeth deviation from the ways of righteousness, and is caused by our no-taste or spiritual disrelish of that life. The work of the ministry is to plant this taste, and to preserve it in God's people. Two objects of this taste: 1. *peace of conscience;* 2. *joy in the Holy Ghost. That peace may best be shadowed out unto us in the known sweetness of temporal peace. The passions of the natural man are in a continual mutiny, to men that yet have no experience of it. The nature of joy in the Holy Ghost may be best exemplified by that cheerful gladness of heart which is the fruit of civil peace. It is the prerogative of man to enjoy himself, and to possess his own soul. In the knowledge of any truth there is joy; but true joy is only in the knowledge of Jesus Christ and of saving truths. The difference betwixt joy and gladness in English, Greek, and Latin.*

1. THE very hope of life eternal would be of itself sufficient to counterpoise all the pleasures and all the grievances incident to this mortal life, (by the one or other of which our souls and affections are withdrawn from pursuit of that happy and blessed life, which hath its beginning here on earth, but hath no end in heaven,) were the belief of it firmly rooted in our souls. If any man swerve from the ways of righteousness, whether in the general course of his life, or in particular acts, it is through want of this hope, either in the act or in the habit. The want of this hope in the habit proceeds from habitual want of our spiritual taste; the want of the same hope in particular acts proceeds from the interruption of this taste in such as sometimes have been partakers of it.

The chief part then of our ministry is, first, to plant this taste; secondly, to preserve it in our hearers. In these two consists *tota ars medendi*, "the whole method of spiritual physic." The objects of our spiritual taste are *peace* and *joy in the Holy Ghost;* for in these two consists the kingdom of God (as was observed before out of Rom. xiv. 17). Without righteousness there is no peace; without peace of conscience there is no joy. First, then, of peace; secondly, of joy.

2. Under the name of *peace* all blessings spiritual 536
are included; it is the fruit of righteousness, and the root or stem of *joy*. The best tidings which the angels could bring unto the people at our Saviour's birth were tidings of *joy;* and in their hymn, after they had ascribed *glory to God*, they declare the original of this *joy* to be *peace on earth, and good-will towards* men. The best legacy which our Saviour had to bestow upon his apostles before his death (after he had, as it were, made his last will and testament) was *peace*, John xiv. 27: *Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid.* And at his first appearance to his disciples being assembled together after his resurrection, he came and stood in the midst of them, and said, John xx. 19, *Peace be with you.* And after he had shewed them his hands and his side, he said to them again, *Peace be unto you*, ver. 21. The same salutation is recorded by St. Luke, chap. xxiv. 36. And this salutation is continued to the church as the sum and brief of all good things which we can desire for ourselves or wish to others. "Peace be to this house, and to all that dwell in it," be the very solemn words which the priest, going to visit the sick, is, by the appointment of our church, to take with him, and to

say when he enters into the sick person's house. And this, I suppose, is enjoined, not so much with reference to the like form of salutation commonly used among the Jews, as either in imitation of that form of blessing prescribed by our Saviour, or rather in obedience and observation of that precept given by him (Matt. x. 12. Luke x. 5.); *Salute the house ye enter into;* and *say, Peace be to this house.* And so likewise (by the church's appointment) we conclude our prayers; "The peace of God," (that is, the peace wherein the kingdom of God consists,) "which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge of God and of his Son Jesus Christ," &c. The form of this blessing is taken from our apostle, Phil. iv. 7; and therein we do but pray for that which the apostle promiseth (in God's name) to the Philippians.

How the peace of God passeth all understanding.

3. But if this *peace* (as our apostle there speaks) surpasseth all understanding, how shall we seek after it, or discover the nature of it? or the nature of that *joy* in the Holy Ghost, which is the fruit of it? Or is this *peace* and this *joy* (one or both of them) that *new name* (written in the *white stone*, Rev. ii. 17.) which Christ promiseth to give to him that overcometh, *which no man knoweth saving he which hath it?* For answer we say, this *peace* surpasseth the understanding of all men who are not acquainted with it; but if it must "keep our hearts and minds, through Jesus Christ," sure we must have an experimental knowledge of it, we must feel and perceive it. So in effect the prophet Isaiah had said, chap. lxiv. 4: *Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.* (1 Cor. ii. 9.) But all this is to be understood of the natural man, or of the man as

yet not partaker of the spirit of regeneration; for, as the apostle tells us, 1 Cor. ii. 10, *God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.* And again, ver. 12: *We have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.* The same spirit gives us a true relish of that *peace* whence these *joys* do spring.

4. But if such as have the taste or relish of it know it better by experience than they can by any map or description of it, how shall we persuade such as do not know it to seek after it? or what description shall we make of it to bring them in love with it? The best description which we can make of it must be 537
taken from the known sweetness of temporal peace, which is but the emblem or shadow of it. And the sweetness of civil peace is always much better known, much better esteemed, *carendo, quam fruendo*, by some interposition of want, than by continual fruition of it. *A consuetis nulla fit passio.* We of this land, which have longer enjoyed civil peace without interruption than any nation in the world besides, have not so true a relish of the sweetness of it as most of our neighbour nations, which within these few years have often felt the bitterness of war, as well domestic or civil as foreign. Necessary therefore will it be for us, which neither have seen nor felt the enemy's sword for these threescore years and more, to use some fiction of war for right conceiving the sweetness even of civil peace.

Imagine, then, we lived in such a land or state as the state of Israel was in the days wherein Isaiah prophesied, or in the days whereof he prophesied, chap. ix. 19, 20: *Through the wrath of the Lord of hosts is the land darkened, and the people shall be as the*

fuel of the fire: no man shall spare his brother. And he shall snatch on the right hand, and be hungry; and he shall eat on the left hand, and they shall not be satisfied: they shall eat every man the flesh of his own arm; Manasseh shall be ready to devour Ephraim, his brother tribe; and Ephraim's intentions against him shall be as cruel; and yet both, like Simeon and Levi, brethren only in mischief and cruelty, shall conspire to ruinate Judah, the sovereign tribe of that people.

Thus imagine the port towns in this kingdom were noisome neighbours to one another by sea; one shire or province ready to make inroads or invasion upon another; or every man's hand in the same town or shire to be lift up against his neighbour; or that a man's worst enemies were of his own house; so many servants, inmates, or sojourners, so many thieves; the children ready to rob and spoil their parents, without hope of redress by ordinary process of wholesome laws; might still overcoming right.

Besides all this, imagine a foreign potent enemy lying still in wait to take all advantages which these civil broils or intestine dissensions afford for subduing the whole state or nation; for bringing the nobles into captivity; for putting such as made resistance unto the sword; to put their children to death before their parents' eyes; and to abuse the bodies of the wives and daughters of such as put themselves upon their courtesy.

If unto a state or kingdom in this distress or perplexity, through civil dissension and domestic broils, any hope of peace and unity amongst themselves could be truly suggested, how beautiful would the feet of such as brought these glad tidings be! And if these hopes were seconded with answerable success, I leave

it to your mature consideration what public joy and exultation would ensue; every man would be ready to bear his part in that song,

Nulla salus bello; pacem te poscimus omnes.

Of civil dissension there can no good come; the very mention of war would be as the rubbing of an unhealed wound or bleeding scar; *dulce nomen pacis*, the very name of *peace* would ensweeten our thoughts, season our cogitations, and add strength and courage to our mutual endeavours for the establishment of it.

5. Now though civil and intestine broils are much worse than open war with a foreign enemy, yet the most perfect pattern of misery which we can frame unto ourselves, as effects of civil dissensions within any city or kingdom, is but a model or picture of that intestine war which every man (if we take him in the state of nature, or before he be reconciled to God 538
through Christ) may find within himself, within his own soul and affections; for every man is a little world or commonwealth, and the less the state or sovereignty is wherein civil dissension is bred and nourished, the more grievous it is. It is more dangerous when fire doth kindle in the same street or neighbour-houses, than when it kindles afar off, though in the same town; but when the house wherein we dwell is set on fire, the danger is greatest. But most bitter and grievous is that dissension or distraction which is bred and nourished in the same breast, as either between the affections and passions which lodge in the sensitive part, or between them and the reasonable soul or conscience, or the perpetual conflict between the flesh and the spirit. Now the affections and passions of every dissolute ill-nurtured man, (as the heathen philosopher had observed,) στασιάζουσι, are in continual mutiny amongst themselves. Immoderate

The tumult and discord of passions in a natural man.

desire or hope of gain sways the one way, and the like desire of other carnal contentments, which cannot be procured without cost or charge, sways the contrary way. The love of rest and ease inclines the soul one way, and desire of credit and fame another; hopes or opportunities of satisfying lust are still encountered with fear of shame. Ambition hales the soul upwards, and fear of loss or danger draws it downwards[t]; so that the soul of a man not yet reconciled to God is still, as it were, upon the rack; one while it takes pleasure in the good things which itself enjoys; and the more it takes delight in these, the more it is tortured with envy against others which enjoy the same or like good things in a greater measure. Or if it were possible for a natural man to compose or hush these mutinies between his several affections, or to draw all his passions or desires unto one head or bent, yet this peace of the affections and passions among themselves, unless the conscience were included in it, (which it never can be in the natural man,) is but a dishonourable peace, and that is much worse than an honourable war. Better it were that a man's desires or passions should band each against other, than that all of them should with joint force band against the spirit or conscience; this would be but as a conspiracy of common soldiers against their leaders, or as a league or confederacy of slaves against their lords, or of subjects against their sovereign and their magistrates; or such a peace as the Roman orator did dissuade the Romans from: *Pax cum Antonio non est pax sed pactio servitutis;* "To make peace with Mark Antony, a turbulent and seditious peer, was but to condition for their slavery."

[t] See book 10. ch. 9. [vol. ix. p. 110. of this ed.] Hor. Serm. lib. ii. sat. 7. Pers. sat. 5.

6. Whether then our affections, our desires or passions, be at enmity one with another, or whether, being at peace one with another, they be not in subjection unto reason or conscience, (as they never are in a man not reconciled to God, or in a man which follows not the ways of righteousness;) every branch of the one or other enmity within a man's self doth as it were make a breach for the common enemy to enter at, who wants no skill, no industry, no vigilancy to work upon all opportunities or advantages for bringing both body and soul, both the reasonable and the affective part, both the flesh and the spirit, into everlasting slavery. No foreign enemy, not the Turk or Mahometan, can harbour such cruel intentions against any Christian state or kingdom, (no, not in his passions or furious mood,) as this adversary, Satan, doth against us all, Christians, Jews, or Turks, even when he complies with us, or seems to be at peace, and promiseth the best contentments which he is permitted to bestow upon his followers. It was his catechism unto Judas to cover his murderous intentions with a fawning kiss; the master knew this lesson much better than the scholar did, and can practise it with more art and skill upon Christ's scholars than his scholar Judas did 539
upon our Lord and Master. Of this civil dissension or intestine war between the several affections of our souls, or between them and our spirits and consciences, and of the danger which by this dissension (unless it be timely appeased) may certainly accrue unto the whole nature from the common adversary, every man may have a sensible experiment in himself, so he would in vacant and sequestered hours unpartially take the information of his own spirit and conscience; and the reflection or ruminating upon the inconveniences of these civil dissensions or intestine wars

within our own souls will kindle in us a desire of spiritual peace, and a resolution to follow the ways which lead unto it; and these are the works of righteousness. Such as are not yet at *peace* with God, many whose affections are not at peace one with another, nor with their own consciences, (which should command in chief,) may be safe or free from any present evil, from any wound as yet given by this adversary; but no man living can be secure from future danger or misery, until he be thus far at least entered into the kingdom of God, as that he hath some impression or relish of that *peace*. His soul and spirit must be brought in subjection to the Spirit of God, so must his affections or desires be subject to his reasonable soul or spirit, before he can know this *peace* by experience, or taste the fruit of it, which is, *joy in the Holy Ghost*.

Of joy in the Holy Ghost.

7. But wherein doth this *joy in the Holy Ghost* consist, seeing it is the issue or fruit of spiritual peace? The nature of it cannot be better exemplified (specially to such as know it not by experience) than by that known joy of heart or gladness which is the fruit of civil or temporal peace; and the fruits of this peace are pithily described by the prophet, *when every man may sit under his own vine and under his own fig tree;* that is, (to give you the importance of this proverbial speech in plain English,) 'when every man may reap the fruits of his own labours or employments, or of the labours, employments, or increase of other creatures, which God hath put in subjection to him; when he may so reap them without molestation, without danger of annoyance.' It is not the possession of lands, of wares, or other good things whatsoever we are lawfully entitled unto, but the quiet fruition or enjoying of them, which fills our hearts with glad-

ness: to have a full flock, and to be deprived of the milk and of the increase of it; to have a goodly vineyard, and to be debarred from gathering the grapes of it, is matter of sorrow and grief, a principal calamity of war; but to enjoy these and the like commodities without danger or molestation is a special comfort of temporal or civil peace; and inasmuch as no man can truly enjoy those good things (which he possesseth or hath right unto) but in time of civil peace, hence it is, that under the name of *this peace* all good things temporal are contained, for without peace we cannot enjoy them.

And this is the prerogative of man above all visible creatures, that the fruit which other such creatures do bring forth, they do not bring it forth unto themselves, but unto man, and for his use, either mediately or immediately. The fields yearly bring forth grass, or other wild herbs, for the food of other living creatures; but even those creatures, with their fruits or increase, serve for the use of man—*Quicquid acquirunt, acquirunt domino.* The sheep being nourished by the grass of the field, yields his yearly fleece, not so much for his own use, as for the use of man; the bees in summer gather honey, but man is principal partaker of the sweetness of it. These and other like sensitive creatures, how much soever they multiply or increase, are never their own, but their owners; that 540
is, some one or other man's; yet not their owners, unless it be in time of civil peace. Contention, whether it be by open hostility of war, or by course of law, always deprives men of the fruition or enjoyment of those good things which are their own, though not always of the possession of them: by peace only we enjoy those things which are our own by right of title and possession; so that civil or temporal peace is the

only nursing mother of civil or temporal joy or gladness.

8. But albeit every one, the meanest amongst us, could not only quietly possess, but peaceably enjoy this whole visible world, (such as it is,) or another as great as this is, and all the good things contained in them; yet (as our Saviour tells us) our *life doth not consist in these;* and what gain or profit could there be in possessing the whole world, in enjoying all the good things contained in it, if we should lose the enjoyment or possession of our own souls? To possess and enjoy the fruit of all other creatures' labours is the prerogative of man, the only remainder of that dominion which the Lord gave him over all other creatures in his first creation; but to enjoy himself is man's peculiar; and is the effect of his reconciliation to his God, and the well-spring of true joy. Other creatures may, by man's permission, reap the fruits of their own labours; as the bee in winter may eat the honey which it makes in the summer, though perhaps not so sweet unto itself as it is unto man, for whose use and service he unwittingly makes it. But no visible creature besides man can possibly enjoy itself, or its own soul and faculties. Sense and feeling many other creatures besides man have, *sed non sentiunt se sentire.* The fowls of the air, the fishes of the sea, the beasts of the field, and the bee, (which best resembles man, as he is a sociable creature,) do respectively at least hear and see, feel and taste, but yet have no true sense or estimate of their own senses, as wherein they exceed grass, trees, or vegetables, or wherein they come short of man. So that man only is capable of enjoying himself and his own soul and faculties; and yet not qualified for enjoying himself and his own faculties until the former peace, the peace of conscience, be in some

No man can truly enjoy himself until he be reconciled to God.

measure wrought in his heart. His sensitive affections, desires, and passions must be first subjected to reason and conscience; his reason, his conscience, and spirit must be subjected unto the Spirit of God, before he can possess his soul in patience; and he must possess his soul with patience before he can taste of that joy which is in the Holy Ghost, before he can bring forth the fruit of holiness, whose end is everlasting life. The taste of this fruit or joy is the only pledge or assurance of that endless joy which is prepared (for such as love God) in heaven.

9. The vine bringeth forth much pleasant fruit; so do the trees of the garden; but they enjoy it not; when it is ripe, it falleth from them, or their owners reap it. But this joy which amounts from the quiet or peaceable possession of our own souls, it grows within us, it ripeneth within us, it multiplieth and it sweeteneth within us; no man can, and God will not, take this joy from us. How fruitful soever we may be, yet we are but unprofitable servants; less profitable to our Lord and Owner than the trees of the garden or forest are to us; yet how unprofitable soever we are to him, he continues most gracious unto us, and permits us to reap and enjoy the fruits of all these good things, which he himself alone doth sow and plant, doth water and cherish, and give increase unto, within our hearts and souls. Were it possible for the husbandman or vinedresser so to infuse the life of sense into the vine, as it might continually taste the sweetness of that fruit which it beareth, and wherewith, as the scripture saith, it cheereth the heart of man, how full would it be of 541
gladness! both root and branch would be as full of mirth and gladness as they are of life and sap. How much more graciously doth God deal with those that hearken to his word, and obey the motions of his

Spirit! We being by nature more dead unto the fruit of holiness, and more destitute of spiritual life, than the vine or fig tree is of the life sensitive, he infuseth a new sense or taste into our souls, and makes them more fruitful than the fig tree, which is never without fruit, either ripe or green; and makes us withal sensible partakers of the sweetness of all the fruit which his Spirit bringeth forth in us; and from the taste of this fruit of holiness ariseth that joy and gladness of spirit which is the pledge and earnest of eternal life.

10. But have we this joy whilst we sojourn here on earth in ourselves, or in our own souls, or in Christ only? So we be fraught with the fruit of holiness, we have this joy as truly in ourselves as we have the fruit, though we have neither of ourselves or from ourselves. We have both in ourselves in such a manner as the vine-branch hath both life and sap in itself, though both originally from the root. So long as the vine-branch continues in the vine, it is really partaker of the life and sweetness of the root. The similitude is our Saviour's, John xv. 1, 2, 3: *I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit he taketh away: and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. Now ye are clean through the word which I have spoken unto you;* for it is *the word* which purgeth us, and maketh us apt to bear fruit in ourselves so long as we are in Christ; for so he addeth, vv. 4, 5: *Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.* And where there is much fruit, there is plenty of joy; for, contrary to the custom of other

husbandmen or vinedressers, the sweetness of the fruit redounds not to the vinedresser, but to the branches that bear it. The fruit is wholly ours; the glory is only God's; for so he adds, ver. 8: *Herein is my Father glorified,* (he doth not say *profited,*) *that ye bear much fruit.* The more we bear, the more we are benefited, the more God is glorified by us; for no man can truly glorify God, until his heart and spirit be cheered with that joy which is the fruit of peace and holiness. *God,* as the apostle tells us, *did never leave himself without a witness;* all the good things which the Gentiles received, even whilst they walked in their own ways, were so many witnesses of his goodness; though they perceived not, it was he that did them good, *that gave them rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness,* Acts xiv. 17. He doth not say with *food and joy;* for joy, properly taken, hath its seat in the mind and spirit of man; nor is it there placed without the Spirit of God; whereas the gladness whereof the apostle there speaks may harbour in the inferior or affective part. This difference, which we now observe between *joy* and *gladness* in our English, the Greek writers curiously observe between εὐφροσύνη and χαρὰ, so do the Latins between *lætitia* and *gaudium.* Every blessing of God, though but a blessing temporal, is matter of gladness even to such as know not or acknowledge not God to be the author of such blessings; but true joy always presupposeth the knowledge of God in Christ, and some acquaintance with the Spirit.

The difference betwixt joy and gladness.

True knowledge of God in Christ necessary to this joy.

11. As it is said in this 22d verse that the end or issue of the fruits of holiness is eternal life, so our Saviour tells us, John xvii. 3, that the same eternal life is the effect or issue of the knowledge of God, and of Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent. These two then 542

do reciprocate; without the knowledge of God and of Christ there is no peace of conscience, no fruit of holiness, no joy in the Holy Ghost; and yet the greater measure of such fruit we have, the more we shall abound in the knowledge of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ, in the knowledge of whom, this joy in the Holy Ghost, which can be had in this world, and life eternal in the world to come, doth consist.

So that the only way to attain unto this joy, wherein the kingdom of God doth consist, is to be rightly instructed in the knowledge of God, whose the kingdom and glory is, and of Jesus Christ, who is our King, even the King of glory.

A joy in the knowledge of any sort of truths.

There is a kind of secret joy in the knowledge or contemplation of every truth, or true principle, though of secular and human arts. And no marvel; for as God is righteousness and holiness itself, so he is truth itself. The truth of all sciences is as truly derived from that truth which he is, as that righteousness and holiness, whereof his saints are made partakers, is from his holiness and righteousness. Now that joy which some heathen philosophers or artists did reap from contemplation of some truths and principles, in themselves but dry and barren, did ofttimes more than counterpoise that inbred delight or pleasure in other secular vanities, which usually missway us Christians to folly and lewdness; yea, this joy did sometimes bring their souls into a kind of rapture or forgetfulness of life natural or sensitive with their contentments. Many of them, in hope to find out the causes of the ebbing and flowing of the sea, of the eclipses of the sun and moon, of other appearances in the heavens, and the like, have been more abstemious and moderate in their diet, and spent more time and hours in observing the motion of the stars, and in perusing every

leaf of the book of nature, or of God's visible creatures, than we bestow in fasting and praying, or in meditation upon *the great mystery of godliness, God manifested in the flesh;* and if they happened to satisfy themselves in these points of truth which they most sought after, the expressions of their joy, and sometimes of their thankfulness to their gods, were ofttimes more hearty and cheerful, than most of us can give any just proof of for all the benefits which God hath bestowed upon us by his gospel. So one of them having found that mathematical principle concerning the equality between the square of the base, and of the sides of a rectangled triangle, did offer up presently a magnificent sacrifice to the gods, or divine powers, from whom he conceived this revelation came unto him. Another, having after long search discovered how much pure gold the goldsmith had taken out of the king of Sicily's crown, and made up the weight of it with silver cunningly mixed, was so overwrought with joy, that he ran instantly out of the bath, naked as he was, forgetting his clothes, crying, Εὕρηκα, Εὕρηκα, "I have found it! I have found it out[u]!"

The philosophers rapt with joy in contemplation and invention.

12. And such as at their vacant times are able but to try the conclusions which these men have found out, or to contemplate the truth and use of those unfailing principles in the mathematics, or in natural philosophy, which they have discovered, may hence reap more pure delight and sincere joy, than the enjoyment of all things temporal, without such contemplation, can afford. Yet the most admirable principles or surest conclusions of human sciences are not so good, at best no better than mere shadows of those

Much more joy in the knowledge of saving truths.

543

[u] The former of the two philosophers was Pythagoras; the latter was Archimedes. Of both, see Plutarch in his book intituled, *Non posse hominem suaviter vivere secundum Epicurum.*

solid truths which are contained in the mystery of godliness. Even the law itself, which God gave unto his people by Moses, is but a picture of that entire truth which is contained in the knowledge of God and of his Christ. Hence, saith our evangelist, John i. 17, *the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.* What shall we say then? was there no truth in the law which was given by Moses? God forbid! It was a law most true; yet the truth of it was but a picture of that live substance of truth which is contained in the gospel, or rather in the knowledge of Christ. If we did only desire that joy or delight which naturally ariseth from the contemplation of the agreement between the principles and conclusions in the same art or science, the whole world besides (though we had the perfect knowledge of it) could not yield that plenty of pleasant speculations which the harmony or consent between the types or figures of the Old Testament, and the live substances answering unto them in the New, or which the known accomplishments of the prophetical predictions exhibit in Christ to all that will seriously meditate on them. What madness is it, then, to be in love or to dote either on shadows in the book of nature or in the pictures of the law, and to neglect the live feature of that substantial truth which presents itself unto our view in the gospel of Christ! The most exact knowledge that can be had in the book of nature or in human sciences doth always end in contemplation; it is but like music, which vanisheth with the motion, it leaves no permanent mirth behind it: whereas the contemplation of the mystery of godliness (so it be frequent and serious) doth always imprint and instil the sweet influence of life and joy into our souls.

The knowledge of human sciences, as it may be

comprehended by the wit of man, so it is terminated with this life; but the knowledge of Christ, or rather Christ himself, (who is the subject of divine knowledge,) is an inexhaustible fountain of truth, whose current still, even in this life, increaseth as our capacities to receive it increase, and so shall increase in the world to come without stint or restraint; for the fruit or issue of it, as you heard before, is everlasting life; and that is a life which hath a beginning here on earth, but shall have no end in heaven.

An Advertisement to the Reader, [by the publisher of the folio edition.]

THOUGH it was told the reader before, [vol. ix. p. 137. of this edition,] that it was the practice of this great author first to deliver in sermons that matter which he intended afterwards to weave or form into the body of his printed discourses, yet the tenor of the last precedent and the next following chapter seems to require that the reader be reminded of the same here again. And withal it be signified, that the epoch or commencement of these tracts must be pitched thirty or more years *retro*, as may be collected out of a passage in the twenty-fifth chapter. And lastly, that the place where these tracts (when they were mere sermons) were preached was the famous town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where our author was a most exemplary, careful, and pious vicar (but how prosperous or successful, God only knows) for divers years together.

CHAP. XXVI. 544

ROMANS VI. 22.

But now.....ye have your fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life, &c.

Whether the taste of eternal life once had may be lost. Concerning sin against the Holy Ghost. How temporal con-

tentments, and the pleasures of sin coming in competition, prevail so as to extinguish and utterly dead the heavenly taste either by way of efficiency or demerit. The advantages discovered by which a lesser good gets the better of a greater.

1. THE fruits of holiness (as hath been said) are *peace and joy in the Holy Ghost;* and in the fruition of this peace and joy consists that taste of eternal life which in this world can be had; and this taste must be perfected and established by the knowledge of Christ, and him crucified; which knowledge hath been the main subject both of my private meditations, and of my labours published in the seventh book of Commentaries upon the Creed.

How this taste of eternal life is preserved.

We are now to inquire how this taste of eternal life must be preserved. The rule is most true in the general, that it must be preserved and perfected by the same means by which it was first planted, and that is, by the knowledge of Christ. So that it is but one question, how the knowledge of Christ may be perfected in us, and how this taste of eternal life may be preserved. The next particular subordinate unto this general is, by what means such as either have, or might have had, the taste of eternal life, come to be deprived of it.

A great question, not impertinent to this inquiry, hath been of late, Whether faith or grace being once had may be lost, or whether lost only for a time, or for ever?

Of questions touching falling from grace.

But, as I have often told you, there is more contention about this point amongst modern writers, than contradiction between their opinions, if they would calmly and distinctly express their meaning.

That from some degree of faith, or from some kind of grace, a man may fall, no man denies. That no

man can fall from the grace of election or predestination, I do not question. And further than this, it is not safe for any to be peremptory in any positive assertion; not fit to dispute without or beyond these lists. As for such as take upon them to dispute this or the like question in these terms, 'Whether a man may fall from saving grace,' they bring it in the end to an issue untriable in this life, at least on their parts. For admit it for a truth (which some do question) that a man may be certain, (*certitudine fidei*,) by the certainty of faith, of his present estate in saving grace, yet no man knows another's heart; he hath no taste or experimental knowledge of those gifts and 545
graces which God bestows upon others; yet unless he know the nature and quality of those gifts and graces wherewith others are endowed, as he doth the nature and quality of those graces wherewith his own heart is seasoned, it will be impossible for him to determine whether the graces which God hath bestowed upon him be for their nature or specifical quality the very same with those which others have had, and finally lose them; yea, whether the grace whereby one man is finally saved, be for specifical quality the same with that by which another is saved. Only this we know and believe, that whosoever is saved, is saved only by the free grace of God, not as it is a quality inherent in us, but as it unites us unto Christ, who is the Author and Fountain of all heavenly gifts and graces. As for the particular manner how God doth work in us or by us, methinks the observation of the wise king might long since have put a period to all the curious disputes of this age. So he said, Eccles. xi. 5: *As thou knowest not what is the way of the spirit*, (by *the spirit*, I take it, he means, *vis formatrix*,) *nor how the bones do grow in the womb of her that is with child: even*

so thou knowest not .... whether shall prosper, either this or that, or whether they both shall be alike good.

2. Wherefore, to wave all these and the like curious questions, which rather breed contention than edification, we will build this discourse upon these two sure foundations:

The first, that the illumination of our minds and spirits—that the taste of the heavenly gift—the participation of the Holy Ghost—the relish of the good word of God, and of the powers of the life to come, are all of them true graces of God through Jesus Christ.

The second, that from these graces some men have fallen, and may yet fall, both totally and finally.

The former principle, to wit, that the participation of the Holy Ghost, the taste of the heavenly gift, &c., are graces of God through Jesus Christ, none but a Pelagian will question.

The second, that from these graces a man may fall both totally and finally, no Christian should question. For it is supposed by our apostle, Heb. vi. 4—7: for no man falls into the sin against the Holy Ghost, but he which hath had these graces and is fallen from them. But shall we hence conclude, that every one which hath had the taste of the good word of God, and of the powers of the life to come, and loseth it for a while, or for a long time, doth thereby fall into the sin against the Holy Ghost? God forbid! it is not every falling away from these gifts and graces, but a falling from them into apostasy, which makes up the measure of that irremissible sin. It is not every sin, but the sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which is unpardonable. And blasphemy against the Holy Ghost always includes a slanderous disposition against the ways of truth, a renunciation of Christ as

their Redeemer, and a backsliding either into atheism, Judaism, or Mahometanism[a].

Now many there be who live a dissolute and ungodly life, whose practices are as bad as may be, which yet do not slander the way of truth, which do not so much as wish in heart, much less profess themselves to be Jews, Turks, or Mahometans, rather than the disciples of Christ. Nor do all which slander Christ and his profession fall into this unpardonable sin, but only such as have tasted of his goodness, and afterwards fall from him, and speak and think contumeliously of him and of the religion which he hath taught us.

3. The whole host of Israel (some few excepted) 546
did murmur against God and against his servant Moses; yet all that murmured were not cut off from seeing of that good land, but only those which had seen his wonders in Egypt, at the Red sea, and in the wilderness; and being of years to lay them to heart, provoked him ten times, that is, as often as they had seen them. As the rejection of those murmuring Israelites from the land of Canaan was a type of such as are reprobated from the kingdom of heaven, so the sin of those that were sent to view the land was a peculiar type or shadow of the sin against the Holy Ghost. These men, after they had seen this good and pleasant land, after they had tasted the fruits of it, brought a malicious slander upon it, that it was a land which ate up its own inhabitants, that it was not worth the pains and danger which they were to undertake in encountering the Anakims and others, which were much stronger than they, and would not be put out of their own possessions but by

[a] See the author's opinion more fully about sin against the Holy Ghost, book 8. chap. 3. [vol. vii. p. 395, &c.]

strong hand, and much blood on both parts. In this manner, if any man, after God hath endowed him with the heavenly gift, and with the taste of the powers of the life to come, shall so far fall away from Christ, as to think that the promises of that blessed life are not worthy of that spiritual warfare without which it cannot be obtained; unworthy of that sincerity and integrity of life which is peremptorily enjoined all that seek after it; and in this resolution—rather in this want of true resolution—forsake the church of God, and despite the Spirit of grace, he by thus doing falls into this irremissible sin. But as our apostle saith unto these Hebrews, so may I say of you, *I hope better things of you;* yea I am persuaded that all and every of you are free from this sin. None of you can pretend ignorance of the ways of life: let me therefore exhort you in the words of our apostle, Heb. vi. 11, 12: *And we desire that every one of you do shew the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end: that ye be not slothful, but followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.* Or as St. Peter speaks, *Give all diligence to make your election sure:* not by way of syllogism, but by good practice and conversation.

4. Reason not thus with yourselves;

He that hath once tasted of saving grace cannot lose the taste of it:

But I have tasted of saving grace:

Therefore I cannot lose the taste of it.

To prevent the uncertain or ticklish issue of such collections, remember,

First, That God doth not promise the kingdom of heaven to subtle disputers, but to faithful practisers.

Secondly, Consider how easy a matter it will be for

Satan, when temptations arise, to shake all the joints of the former syllogism, and to dissipate and break the major proposition, 'He that once tasted of saving grace cannot lose it,' into shivers. For that (in any ordinary or intelligible sense) is saving grace, from which, if a man do not fall, (or lose the taste of it,) he shall be saved, without addition of any other grace besides that which it is supposed he hath. Is it then apparent, that a man may fall from that grace, or lose the taste of that grace, in which, if he did continue or not lose the taste of it, he should be saved? Yes; this is as clear as the daylight: for whosoever doth continue in the participation of the Holy Ghost, or doth not lose the taste of the heavenly gift, or of the powers of the world to come, shall never perish, shall be saved. Impossible it is that any man should enter into the 547
estate of death, or of reprobation, so long as he hath the taste of the life to come implanted in his heart and spirit: and this is for nature and quality saving grace. But some that have tasted of this grace do utterly lose the taste of it, and so fall from grace in itself sufficient to save their souls. For though all that lose this taste do not sin against the Holy Ghost, yet no man can sin against the Holy Ghost until he lose this taste, and yet no man can lose this taste but he that hath had it.

The conclusion then is most pregnant, that it is more possible, or a shorter passage, for a man to fall from saving grace, or to lose the taste of it, than to sin against the Holy Ghost. The most useful meditations then will be to discover the means whereby such as once have had the taste of the heavenly grace do come to lose it, with their several degrees; and these are divers:

5. First, It is to be supposed that God doth by his

They only enjoy and keep this taste, that diligently seek after it and truly prize it.

Spirit infuse this taste into men's souls, not continually or uncessantly, but, as we say, by fits or turns: this taste of the powers of the life to come is sometimes transient; we cannot have it when we list, but must expect God's providence, and attend his pleasure for the renewing of it, and crave the assistance of his Spirit for producing it, by humble supplication and prayer. Want of the due esteem of it whilst we have it, negligence in the duty of prayer and other godly exercises, doth deprive us of it, when we might have had it renewed in us; God doth not promise that any shall enjoy this pearl besides such as diligently seek after it; and when they have found it (or rather when it hath found them) do duly prize it. And as this taste of eternal life is often for a time lost, or much prejudiced, by mere negligence in sacred duties, so it may be choked and stifled by errors or mispersuasions, which insinuate themselves into men's thoughts or fantasies, after they had been partakers of it.

The danger of seeking to enjoy worldly contentments, together with this heavenly taste.

Many there be which will unfeignedly acknowledge, that the pledge or earnest of eternal life, which they have received, is of more worth and value than all the pleasures or contentments of this world which can oppose or countersway the desires of it; and yet the same men (through the sleights and subtilty of Satan) play but the sophisters with their own souls; thus assuming or resolving, that albeit the taste of the heavenly gift be more to be desired than all the temporal contentments which are incompatible with it, yet the taste of these heavenly joys and the contentments of this life which may be enjoyed with it are better than it alone; for one good, how little soever, being added to another, how great soever, makes some addition of goodness[b].

[b] See this fallacy in Aristotle's Rhetoric.

Thus many covetous men and oppressors will easily be persuaded, that they may increase their temporal estate without any forfeiture of their estate in God's spiritual blessings. The ambitious or aspiring mind thinks he may glorify God more by his high place or dignity in church or commonwealth, than by continuing a private and retired life. As for the drunkard, the glutton, and the lascivious man, they seldom are persuaded that they may continue their wonted courses and enjoy the taste of the heavenly gift. And for this reason, many that have been subject to these sins have been more easily won to the love of truth and of saving grace, than the proud, the covetous, the ambitious or envious men are, because the one in his sober thoughts foresees the danger and acknowledgeth his sins, whereas the other rejoiceth continually in his 548
courses without suspicion of danger.

6. Or if the covetous or ambitious mind sometimes suspects his ways, yet being engaged to pursue them, lest he might be thought to have varied in his course of life, the best repentance which he usually attains unto is but like his in the poet:

> Id primum, si facta mihi revocare liceret,
> Non cœpisse fuit; cœpta expugnare secundum est:

"If I were to begin the world again, I should haply make choice of another kind of life; but being engaged, the next point is to make the best of that course of life which I have chosen." And yet the more he makes of it, the worse he speeds in it in the main chance, the more he prejudiceth the habitual or actual taste of eternal life; for the more we are accustomed to any course of life, the more we delight in it, and are weaned from it with greater difficulty. And yet we must be weaned even from the world itself before we can rightly taste *the sincere milk* of the gospel, or be

capable of that strong meat which is contained in this article of eternal life, and others concerning Christ, by which the taste of this life must be fed and nourished. So that of all sins, pride, covetousness, and ambition are the most dangerous; both because they be of more credit or less infamy in the world, and because they multiply their acts the most, and may work uncessantly.

But though it be for the most part as true of these times wherein we live, as it was in the days of our Saviour's conversation here on earth, that publicans and open sinners are oftentimes nearer to the kingdom of heaven, than many which live a more sober or civil life, but yet are covetous, vainglorious, or envious, as the scribes and Pharisees were; yet there is no man that sets his heart to taste of any unlawful pleasures, though of those pleasures which in his sober thoughts he condemns, but doth hereby weaken or dead his taste of the food of life, and make himself subject to former temptations whensoever they shall assault him. However, in the absence of temptations, they may seem unto themselves and unto others to repent, yet when fresh ones arise, they usually come to the same vent at which the affections of that incestuous wanton in the poet broke out when she said—

Taste of unlawful pleasures deads and loseth the heavenly taste.

> ..... Denique non possum innoxia dici,
> Quod superest multum est in vota, in crimina parvum.

"I am an offender already, and if I shall go on but a little, this may give greater satisfaction unto my desires than it can add unto the measure of my sin." But voluntarily to give satisfaction to any unlawful desire or wish, upon these or like resolutions, is much worse than the desire itself, how bad soever that be, and may with speed make up a greater measure of sin in a moment, than that which had been long in gathering before.

7. It is agreed upon amongst the moralists, that every vicious or unlawful act doth dispose the soul of man unto the vicious habit or custom whereunto such vicious acts do tend; and after the habit or custom be by many acts produced, every following act (specially if it be undertaken deliberately, and out of choice) doth add a kind of weight unto the habit once produced, or a stiffness of bent or sway unto the faculty or propension wherein the custom is seated. The more men addict themselves to any practice, or the longer any custom in evil is continued, the more apt they are to be swayed with lesser temptations, than could have moved them amiss before such custom or practice.

549 Unlawful pleasures and sinful acts destroy the heavenly taste, both by efficiency and demerit.

Thus much the heathens had observed by light of nature; and what they speak of morally vicious habits or customs, is most true of wicked or ungodly practices or customs; for besides this, that every sinful act (specially if it be committed out of deliberation or choice) doth increase the strength of the habit or implanted desire whence it flows, it doth withal provoke God, who is the giver of every good and perfect gift, the only preserver of men from sin and wickedness, both to revoke those good gifts which he hath given them, and to withdraw the influence of his restraining grace from them, according to the tenor of our Saviour's words, *And from him that hath not, shall be taken even that which he hath:* and those once being taken away,

Tunc vaga prosiliet frœnis natura remotis.

Our natural corrupt desires run further riot on a sudden, than whilst we were in the course of nature they ordinarily did, or could have done; and become so far exorbitant, that men either lose the taste of the heavenly gift altogether, or cannot be reclaimed by

it, without the assistance of some new grace or heavenly gift.

A question there is amongst the school divines, whether any actual sin, how gross soever, can expel or extinguish grace by natural efficacy, (as cold expelleth, or moisture quencheth, heat,) or only by way of demerit. That by way of demerit vicious acts may quench this taste of eternal life, all do grant; that is, 'they may and do provoke God, who is the giver of all grace, either to withhold that grace, which otherwise he would bestow upon such men, or to take away such graces from them as he hath already bestowed upon them.' But that any vicious acts or habits should expel grace after the same manner as one vicious moral habit doth expel the contrary virtue, (as drunkenness doth expel sobriety, or as intemperance in any kind doth temperance,) this some great schoolmen deny or question. But, leaving these curious and inextricable disputes, we will hold ourselves only to such useful queries as fall under our former aim or level.

How worldly pleasures and temporal contentments come to prevail against the taste of eternal life.

8. The most useful query in this case is, whether it be ordinarily possible that the taste of the heavenly gift, or of the powers of the life to come, (where it hath been once planted,) can be prejudiced by the proposal of any temporal contentment, whilst they stand in actual competition, or whilst we deliberate whether the pursuit of the one be to be preferred (for the present) to the other. That any man, which hath any true notion or relish of eternal life, should be swayed to follow the ways of death, otherwise than through incogitancy, or want of actual consideration, may justly seem most improbable, if not impossible. For he that truly apprehends or relisheth the sweet

fruits of holiness, the peace of conscience, joy in the Holy Ghost, (or if any other pledge there be of eternal life,) cannot but acknowledge, that these are more worth than any temporal contentment which can come in competition with them. Now it is a mere madness to make choice of a lesser good before a greater, so long as it is actually apprehended or acknowledged to be greater; there must be a defect or intermission in the precedent deliberation before any man can be overtaken with this kind of madness. Carnal contentments we apprehend or relish by our natural faculties; peace of conscience or spiritual joy are apprehended or relished only by grace; and these two several apprehensive faculties are as the two scales in a balance: whence it may seem as impossible for one that hath a true apprehension or relish of spiritual good to be overswayed to the contrary evil with any temporal contentment, which for the present can be presented to his deliberation, as for a greater weight being put in the one scale of the balance to be overpoised by a lesser weight put in the other.

Faculties natural, and grace, two scales.

The comparison, I confess, if it be rightly weighed, will hold most exactly: if the scales be even or equipendent, and the beam or balance be equally divided, it is impossible that a lesser weight put into the one scale should counterpoise a greater; but in case the beam or balance be unequally divided, that is, if one part be longer than the other, a lesser weight put in that scale which hath the longer part of the balance, will overpoise a far greater weight put into the other scale.

9. This was an usual kind of cozenage in ancient times, practised by such as sold costly wares, and was excellently discovered by Aristotle in his Mechanical

Questions. The truth of his discovery is most apparent in the ancel weight or balance, (which most of you have seen,) wherein one pound weight put upon the one end of the balance, will counterpoise a stone weight put upon the other end. And the inequality between the several portions of the same beam or balance may be such, that a stone weight being put upon the one end will fetch back a hundred stone weight being put upon the other.

From this experimental principle did the great mathematician, Archimedes, ground that assertion, which seemed a paradox: *Da ubi consistam, et devolvam terram:* If he might choose his distance or standing-place, he would roll the whole earth about by his own strength. As imagine the line, which goes from the centre of the earth unto that part of the heavens which is above our heads, and through it, were as firm and strong as a pillar of brass or steel, the strength of one man's arm placed in the highest heaven, or in such a place as this mathematician desired to have footing in, might poise or turn about the whole earth, and all the creatures in it.

The former discovery of falsehood in visible and material balances is clear to sense, and may be demonstrated to reason; but the heart of man is more deceitful than any balance, and the deceit of it was never discovered either by the mathematician or by the philosopher, nor is it discernible without diligent circumspection to a man's own self. The deceit in the general herein consists; 'That albeit the apprehensive faculties, by which we discern spiritual joy and temporal contentments, be, to our seeming, as equally set as any two scales in a balance can be, or though our actual apprehension of matters spiritual be for the present more lively and quick than our apprehensions of

temporal contentment, yet our habitual propension or customary inclination to some temporal pleasures or delights may be much greater than our propension or inclination to any spiritual good.' And yet this exorbitant propension or inclination unto things temporal may be insensibly contracted, and the strength for a long time not apprehended, not suspected by us. As bad humours gather (unwittingly to us) in our bodies, and grow to a deadly or desperate issue before we apprehend any danger; so may our propensions or affections to some earthly vanity or other increase and multiply, before we apprehend their strength or stiffness. And in this case alone, when our natural propensions or affections to any temporal contentment exceed our propensions to spiritual joy or peace of conscience, a temporal and momentary good being proposed to our actual or deliberate choice, may oversway the greatest spiritual good which we can for the present oppose unto it; such a good as, before this temptation did arise, we would have chosen before any temporal contentment which we did actually apprehend or could think of.

10. If it be further demanded, whether in this case 551
a lesser good may be chosen before a greater; or whether this can happen without some spice of madness; we should frame our answer by the former comparison between a lesser weight and a greater being put into the even scales of an unequal balance: that the lesser weight should overpoise the greater it were unpossible, unless the propension of that part of the balance, wherein the lesser weight is put, did further exceed the propension of the other part, wherein the greater weight was put, than the greater weight doth the lesser, supposing they were to be weighed, not in

even scales only, but in an equal balance. If the greater weight (or material to be weighed) have the same proportion to the less, that six hath to four, and the one part of the balance, wherein the lesser weight is put, have the same proportion of length or propension which six hath to four, neither shall overpoise other. But if the propensions of the several parts of the same balance have the same proportion that seven hath to four, four pounds put in the one scale will overpoise six pounds put in the other. By the greater propension, you are to understand, not a greater declination, or lower pendence of the one scale in respect of the other, but a greater facility or aptitude to be declined or moved downwards.

The philosopher had long ago observed, that *circuli majores semper moventiores*, "the greater compass the wheel hath, the more apt it is to be moved," and being once moved, it moves more swiftly than a lesser. And for the same reason the longer part of the same diameter or beam in a balance is more propense or apt to be moved than the shorter part, though the weight or strength which poiseth both be equal: for it moves not only by virtue of its own weight or strength which poiseth it, but by the virtue of his own propension or inclination to be moved. Every further degree of its propension or inclination to be moved falls into the same reckoning with the weight or strength which moves or poiseth it.

The case is the same in the question proposed between a greater and a lesser good, as between temporal contentment and spiritual joy, considered in the general, or between their several branches. We must not compare the objects or matters of the several contentments only, for so it is evident that a lesser good

is usually chosen before a greater; but we must consider the objects as they jump or meet with our propensions or inclinations to them.

Now albeit any branch of spiritual goodness may be actually apprehended as much the better before it come to actual competition or counterpoise with some temporal good; yet if our propension to any branch of temporal good be greater than our propension to the contrary spiritual good, the propension to the temporal good when it meets with a suitable object, and opportunity to embrace it, is so actuated and enlivened by it, that it breaks out into a desire; and the goodness of our desire doth so intermingle itself with the foreapprehended goodness of the thing desired, that they concur as exactly to make up the same measure of goodness, as a crown of gold and a crown of silver do to make up the same sum of money. Whence, if our desire or propension to any temporal contentment be greater than our propension to the former spiritual good, the goodness of the object desired being added unto it will oversway our inclination to the spiritual good; and however in the absence of tempting objects we esteem the spiritual good to be much greater than any temporal contentment, yet the goodness of the desire or propension to any temporal contentment, if it 552
be excessive, after once it come to join with a lesser actual good, will sway our choice to that which is worse, although there be no defect in the present act of deliberation.

11. These discussions, though unto some they may seem too curious, yet are they useful, and give us the true meaning of our Saviour's advice or precept unto all that desire to come unto him: *If any man*, saith he, Luke xiv. 26, 27, *come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and bre-*

Moderating of worldly desires and natural affections necessary for gaining and preserving the heavenly taste.

thren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple. And again, after two similitudes and parables premised, the one, of a man intending to build a house; the other, of a king going to make war against another king; he concludes in the same words, ver. 33, *So likewise, whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple.* This is the first reckoning or account which a Christian must make before he undertake that sacred war against the prince of this world, or before he consecrate himself to be a spiritual temple unto the Lord; otherwise he undertaketh both enterprises rashly and unadvisedly.

But wherein doth this forsaking of father and mother, and all that we have, consist?

The answer to this query is, first, negative, then, affirmative.

First, it doth not consist in the abdication or abandoning of our secular callings; not in casting off all care of our father and mother, and other friends; not in selling of all that we have, though with intention to give it to the poor. Wherein then? In the limiting or moderating of our affections or desires unto these or other things temporal. A mountain of gold could not have swayed so much with St. John as thirty pieces of silver did with Judas, so unequally was the balance of his heart set, that this small sum being put as it were in the one scale, did overpoise his Lord and Master, who was the fountain of all spiritual graces, being put in the other scale. It was not then the weight of the money, but the excess of his desire and propension to money, which made him so foully to miscarry.

The whole art or skill of a Christian consists in

these two points: first, in examining or finding out the strength or sway of his affections unto things temporal; and secondly, in abating or weakening their strength, or in weaning his soul from such desires. This is that which the scripture calls *the circumcision of the heart*, and that is no other than a putting off of all superfluous or impertinent desires, or a lopping or limiting of our natural desires, that they extend not beyond our compass. A grain of faith or spiritual grace may sway more in a man of moderate desires, than an ounce of the same faith or grace can do in a man of immoderate or vast desires. The first fruit of grace is to moderate our desires or affections; this is the only way to become rich in faith and rich in grace. Thus much the heathen philosopher [a] had observed, "that the way to be truly rich was not to make continual addition to our wealth or coin, but by substraction or abatement of our desires of it." Unless we use the same method in matters spiritual, we can have no certainty of our salvation, no assurance of our settled estate in grace; albeit our apprehensions of eternal life through Christ be quick and lively; albeit our zeal to the professors of the truth be strong and fervent.

Though it be most true which St. John saith, that *greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the world*, that is, Christ Jesus is much stronger than the 553
devil; yet, unless we hold our desires and propensions to things temporal within compass, and keep ourselves within the bounds which he hath set us, we have no assurance of his protecting of us against his adversary, who is much stronger than we are or can be without his special protection.

[a] Seneca.

Watchfulness and sobriety also are necessary.

But say we have set a short period to our desires of things temporal, and brought our natural affections into a tolerable subjection unto the spirit of grace, are we hereby freed from danger, or from suffering prejudice in our spiritual taste of eternal life? No; besides that moderation of our natural desires or affections, in which the forsaking of all that we have consists, there is required a perpetual watchfulness over all our ways; we must carefully look to every particular step; for as a judicious divine hath well observed, albeit he which is thus far a Christian in heart be endowed with the extraordinary graces of the Spirit, be like a man of an able and active body well armed and skilful in the use of his weapons; yet even such a man may quickly take the foil, if his adversary encounter him upon a slippery ground; for this reason, as there must be an habitual forsaking of all that we have, lest otherwise our own concupiscences do tempt and betray us; so there must be a perpetual watchfulness, to prevent all advantages which the great tempter never ceaseth to seek out against us. Hence is that other precept of our Saviour so often inculcated by himself and by his apostles: ***Be sober, and watch—Watch and pray continually***, &c. Without sobriety there can be no watchfulness; and this sobriety consists, not only in the moderation of our meat and drink, or other pleasure of the sense, but in the government of our very thoughts and speeches. It includes a maturity of judgment and deliberation in all our resolutions and undertakings; it is no less opposed to restless or hasty furious passion, than to habitual excess in any other kind whatsoever. For,

Sobriety consists not only in temperance of meat and drink, but in ruling our thoughts and words.

Celeritas semper malis conatibus addita comes,

unruly or prodigious acts are for the most part ushered by rashness. A lesser weight, if it move

swiftly, or be violently thrown, will sway more, and give a greater blow, than a far greater weight, which moveth slowly or with less violence. The swiftness of motion or violent passions will missway our inclinations or propensions, though in themselves moderate, as far as the settled weight of an habituate inclination or custom.

Now albeit we be commanded *to be sober and watch, to watch and pray continually*, yet this being an affirmative precept, *obligat semper, non ad semper*, though it always binds us, yet it doth not bind us to all times alike. The due observance of it is more specially required at those times which are set apart by God's law, as the sabbath is, or at those times which are by the church consecrated for religious meditations and performances, such as is this instant time of Lent; if I should term it *the holy time of Lent*, I should with some men incur the censure of superstition, seeing all times are alike holy. Be it so! if we consider them in themselves: yet the time of Lent being sequestered or set apart by the church, those feastings or merry meetings, which in the season of joy lately past were not unlawful, if the like should be practised or exercised in it, would convince the practisers of profaneness.

I know there is a doctrinal error, too well entertained in many parts of this kingdom, which much hinders the due observance of this time; but so it doth the performance of many other necessary duties. The error is this; that human laws, or laws ecclesiastic, made by the church, do not bind the conscience. This doctrine hath been maintained by some 554
worthy and orthodox pastors in this church without any error, if their meaning were rightly conceived. But what they conceive not amiss, is so expressed, that

it hath occasioned many to err foully, not in doctrine only, but in practice. Their meaning, I know, is no more than this; that no man doth sin or wound his conscience but by transgressing some law of God. This, *in thesi*, is most true; yet let me request you to remember or consider, (what hath been told you before in the controversy between us and the Romish church concerning Christian obedience and loyalty to princes,) that however no man can sin but by transgressing God's laws, yet an ecclesiastic or human law being made this year for restraint of our liberty in things indifferent, may make the same act or practice to be a transgression of God's law, which the year or years before had been no transgression of it. But the law concerning the observation of Lent, as well in respect of diet as of frequenting the house of God, is not of this or the last year's standing; it hath the warrant and custom of the ancient church, and the highest authority of this kingdom to give it countenance. And whilst either the church or laws of the kingdom do enjoin you to do these things, which in themselves are not unlawful, in obeying them you obey God's law, which commands obedience; in disobeying them you disobey the laws of God, which forbid disobedience to the higher powers. If then you will obey the laws, specially where they command fasting, or abstinence, or devotion in public, God will bless your private devotions, and your use of meat and drink the better.

CHAP. XXVII.

ROMANS VI. 23.

For the wages of sin is death; but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

About the merit of good works. The Romanist's allegations from the force of the word mereri *amongst the ancients; and for the thing itself, out of holy scriptures. The answers to them all respectively: some prove* aut nihil aut nimium. *The different value and importance of causal paritcles;* for, because, &c. *A difference between* not worthy *and* unworthy. *Christ's sufferings, though in time finite, of value infinite. Pleasure of sin short, yet deserves infinite punishment. Bad works have the title of wages and desert to death; but so have not good works to life eternal.*

The final recompense of our doings, good or bad.

1. *Death* (as was expressed in the 21st verse) is the end of sin, and *life eternal* (as you have it verse the 22nd) is the end of holiness, or of the service of God. The proof of both assertions you have in this 23rd verse, because *death is the wages of sin*, and *life eternal the gift of God;* the last and best gift, wherewith he crowneth such as serve him in holiness and righteousness. Now the final recompense or reward (whether that be good or bad) is the end or period of all our ways or works. Herein then doth life and death everlasting only agree; that as well the one as the other is the end or issue of men's several ways or courses here on earth. Yet these ends are contrary the one to the other; and so are the ways which lead unto them. The only way to the one is righteousness and holiness; the ready way unto the other is sin and wickedness. But however sin be injustice, and the 555
author of sin be most unjust; yet herein they both observe the rule of justice, that they pay their servants their wages to a mite: and unless the righteous Judge did moderate their cruelty, they would pay their

servants more than is their due. But doth not the just Judge deal so with his servants? Yes; he pays them more than is their due; yet this he doth without injustice; for he rewardeth them, not according to the rule of justice, but according to his mercy and bounty. To punish men beyond their desert is injustice; but to reward men above their deserts is no way contrary to justice, but an act of mercy triumphing over justice.

But hath justice no hand, no finger in distribution of the final reward of holiness?

This is or should be the brief issue of that great controversy between the Romanists and reformed churches: *An bona opera renatorum mereantur vitam æternam;* "Whether the good works of men regenerate do deserve or merit eternal life." And it is a very good rule which a great champion of reformed churches hath given us, to reduce all controversies to those places of scripture wherein they are properly seated, and out of whose sense or meaning they are emergent.

Chemnitius's rule.

To handle them (especially in pulpit) upon other occasions, or to go out of our way to meet with them, is but to nurse contention. And of all the places in scripture which are brought either *pro* or *con* for the merit of works, none is more pertinent, none more fit to be discussed, than this 23d verse of Romans vi.

Those answers which are often given by Romanists unto other places of scripture (alleged by our writers) will appear impertinent, if they be rightly examined by our apostle's conclusion in this chapter.

Our method in handling this controversy shall be this:

First, To set down the arguments brought by the Romanist for establishing the merit of works.

Secondly, To press the sense and meaning of our apostle (in this 23d verse of Rom. vi.) against them.

Thirdly, To join issue with them, or to set down the true state of the question, not only betwixt us and them, but between the just Judge and our own souls and consciences.

The Romanist's allegation; from the force of the word *merit*.

2. First they allege, 'that the word *merit* is frequent in the ancient fathers of the church, and that albeit the same word be not so frequent in the scripture, yet the matter itself, which the fathers express by the word *mereri*, is often intimated or necessarily implied in terms equivalent;' and if we agree upon the matter, it is but a vanity to wrangle about words.

Both points of their allegation deserve the scanning.

To the first, concerning the word *mereri*, or *to merit*, in the Latin fathers; we reply, that as coins or metals instamped, so words, do change their value or importance in different ages and in several nations [x]; custom hath as great authority in the one case as sovereign power hath in the other. *Mereri*, "to merit," imports as much (in the ancient secular Roman or Latin writers) as to deserve that which we sue for, or attain unto, or to have a just title unto it; so a soldier is said to *merit* his pay, a servant his wages, and good statesmen or commanders in war their honours. But unto this pitch or scantling the ecclesiastic writers, as St. Austin, St. Jerome, or, later, as St. Bernard, do not extend the word *merit: mereri* (according to their meaning) is no more than *assequi*, that is, to attain or get that which men desire. So Turonensis brings in a blind man supplicating to an holy man of his time in this form: *Ut possim per preces tuas me-* 556

[x] Hor. de Arte.

reri visum; "that I may merit my sight through your prayers." In which words the word *mereri,* "to merit," can imply no more either in the poor man's meaning or in this historian's, than *assequi,* "to get or obtain;" for no man can merit any thing by another's prayers: if these could properly merit or deserve any thing at God's hand, the merit should be his whose prayers God vouchsafed to hear, not his for whom he prayed.

The same word *mereri,* with some writers, doth not import so much as to obtain or get any thing at God's hands by virtue of our own or others' prayers, but only to be an occasion or condition, without which that which befalls us, though not desired by us, should not have befallen us. So (as we said before) one speaks of Adam's sin: *Felix peccatum quod talem meruit Redemptorem;* "O happy sin, which merited such a Redeemer!" Now there is nothing in the world which could less deserve any benefit at God's hand than sin, which yet was the occasion or condition without which the Son of God had not been incarnate, at least had not been consecrated through affliction to be our Redeemer. No act or work of God, no not the first work of creation, was of more free gift or bounty, (as the Romanists grant,) or less merited, (either *de condigno* or *de congruo,* by any work of ours,) than the work of our redemption. So that the word *merit,* how often soever it be used by the ancient Latin fathers, carries no weight to sway us to any conceit of true worth in our works for the purchasing of eternal life.

3. But what if the Holy Ghost speak thus, in formal or equivalent terms; as, that eternal life is the wages or stipend of our works, or that our works are worthy of the kingdom of heaven, or of the life to come; shall we not subscribe unto him? Yes, we will, if the Romish

church can prove unto us that he thus spake or meant. Now that he thus speaks or means they endeavour thus to prove; first, from all those places of scripture in which eternal life is said to be μισθὸς, or *merces*, that is, a *reward* or *stipend*. Now our Saviour himself thus speaketh, Matt. v. 11, 12: *Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you.* From this and the like places they labour to infer, that the patience of martyrs is meritorious of eternal life.

The Romanist's second proof of merit.

To this and the like places the answer is easy: the Greek μισθὸς, and so the Latin *merces*, imply no more, in the language of the Holy Ghost, than our English word *reward;* and hence the fruit or issue of our pains, so it be grateful to men, though no way deserved, is called μισθός. So our Saviour saith, that the very hypocrites (which do all their works to be seen of men, if they gain applause) have their reward. Yet no man will say, that a dissembler or hypocrite doth deserve or merit this reward, but rather punishment. And rewards, we know, are sometimes given freely, out of mere bounty and liberality, as well as by way of desert or merit; yea, it is not properly a reward, unless it be a gratuity or largess. That which a man works for upon covenant, or that which he receives by way of hire, is not a reward, but a just pay or stipend; and though it be most true, *that God renders to every one according to all his ways*, yet in propriety of speech he is said to reward none but those whom he remembers in mercy and bounty; for so it is said, Heb. xi. 6: *He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them*

The answer.

557 *that diligently seek him;* not so of such as seek him not, for them he punisheth; and no branch of punishment is any branch of reward.

This then we learn from our apostle, that the first thing to be believed in all ages is this, that there is a God; the second, that this God is a rewarder of those that seek him. This truly infers that his reward is worth the seeking after, whether it be bestowed upon us in this or in the life to come; but it doth not infer that our seeking after it is meritorious, or worthy of the least of his rewards. And though eternal life be the best and last reward of such as seek God, yet it is not the only reward that he bestows on them that seek him; yea, he bestows eternal life, or the life of glory, upon none upon whom he doth not first bestow the reward of grace. The kingdom of grace is but the entrance into the kingdom of glory. And we teach new converts to pray in the first place for the kingdom of grace, and to pray for it as the reward or gift of God. Yea and the Romanists themselves do grant, that no man can merit the kingdom of grace, which is properly the reward of such as seek God; so that all their arguments which they draw from this topic, that eternal life is called μισθὸς, or *merces*, and may therefore be merited by us, are altogether groundless; all of them conclude, *aut nihil aut nimium*, either nothing at all, or a great deal too much; as, that the first grace may be merited; which they themselves deny.

The Romanist's third argument.

4. Their next chief topic is, that our works or endeavours are said to be worthy of eternal life, and that in canonical scriptures. To this purpose cardinal Bellarmine citeth that of our Saviour, Luke x. 7: *Dignus est operarius mercede sua—The labourer is worthy of his hire.* But I am persuaded that he took this upon trust from some idle or ignorant scholar

whom he had employed to rake testimonies for his present purpose. If his leisure had served him to look upon the circumstances of the text with his own eyes, he might clearly have seen that our Saviour there speaks not of eternal life, or of the reward or gift of God, but of that hire which is due unto the preachers of the gospel from such as are instructed in the gospel.

The other testimonies alleged by him are more pertinent, though not concludent; and they are in number three:

Bellarmine's reasons.

The first is, Luke xx. 35: *But they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage.*

The second is, 2 Thess. i. 4, 5: *We ourselves,* saith he, *glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulation that ye endure: which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye also suffer.*

The third is, Rev. iii. 4: *Thou hast a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments; and they shall walk with me in white: for they are worthy.*

This last testimony affords them a new topic or frame of arguments, which they draw from this and the like places wherein the works or righteousness of the saints are assigned as true causes why they enter into the kingdom of heaven. So our Saviour saith in the final sentence, Matt. xxv. 34, 35, 36: *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was*

an hungred, and ye gave me meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick,
558 *and ye visited me: I was in prison, and ye came unto me.* This is as much, saith Bellarmine, as if he had said, 'Ye are therefore blessed of my Father; ye shall therefore enter into the kingdom of heaven, because ye have done these and the like good works out of your love and charity towards me.' Now if these works be the cause why they enter into the kingdom of heaven; and if those of Sardis were to walk with him in *white robes*, because they were worthy; the controversy may seem concluded, that good works are meritorious of heavenly joys, or of eternal life.

5. To the latter objections or frame of arguments drawn from these and the like places, *For I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat*, &c., Calvin makes answer, 'That these and the like particles — *quia, etenim—for*, or *because*[y]—do not always import or denote the true cause of things, but sometimes only the order or connexion betwixt them.' But however this may be true, it is not so punctual, but that Bellarmine and others take their advantage from it, as having the authority of the grammar rule against it; for the particles used in all the places alleged by them are conjunctions, not copulative or connexive, but causal; and it may seem harsh to say that some conjunction causal doth not import a causality. It is true; yet sometimes they import no cause at all of the thing itself, but only of our knowledge of it. Ofttimes again they import no efficacious causality of the thing itself,

y The causal particles, *for, because*, and the like, imply not merit of works. And see more of them, book 8. ch. 15. [vol. vii. p. 511.]

but only *causam sine qua non*, that is, some necessary means or condition, without which the prime and principal cause doth not produce its effect.

To give you examples or instances of both these observations: If there should come into this or the like corporation a stranger who knows not any magistrate by sight, he would say, 'Surely this is the chief magistrate, because all others give place unto him, because the ensigns of authority are carried before him.' Here the word *because* must necessarily denote a true cause, but not the cause why he is the chief magistrate (for that is only his true and just election). What cause doth it then denote? The cause of his knowledge of him to be the chief magistrate. Thus, when we come to the knowledge of the cause by the effect, the effect is the cause of our knowledge of the cause; as others giving place unto him, or the carrying of the ensigns of authority before him, is not the cause why this or that man is the chief magistrate for the time being, but rather his being the chief magistrate is the cause why all others give him place, and why the ensigns of authority are borne before him; yet these and the like effects are the true cause or reason of a stranger's knowledge of him to be the chief magistrate.

And by this rule we are to interpret that saying of our Saviour, *Many sins are forgiven her; for she loved much.* In which speech it may not be denied but that the particle *for* imports a true cause; yet no cause of the thing itself, to wit, of her love. For this were utterly to reverse or thwart our Saviour's meaning, which was no other than this, *that the forgiveness of her sins was the cause of her love;* so was not her love the cause of the forgiveness of her sins, which, by our adversary's confession, being of free grace, and

of the first grace which was bestowed upon her, could not be merited or deserved. Howbeit the manner of expressing of her love, by washing his feet with her tears, and wiping them with her hairs, was the true cause of every understanding or observant man's knowledge, that many sins were forgiven her; and unless she had an apprehension of her manifold sins
559 thus freely forgiven her, she could not have loved him so much, or made such expression of her love.

6. Sometimes again this particle *for*, or the like causal speech, imports only a subordinate or instrumental cause, or a necessary means or condition required, without which the *positive*, the principal and only efficacious cause, (especially if it work freely,) doth not produce its intended effect. To put the case home in this present business: Suppose a great and potent prince out of his own mere motion and free grace should proclaim a pardon to an army of traitors and rebels which had in justice deserved death; if a man should ask what is the cause or reason why the law doth not proceed against them, no other cause could be assigned besides the gracious favour of the prince. But if one should further ask, why the pardon being freely promised to all, the principal malefactors (it may be) are pardoned, or restored to their blood, or advanced to dignities, whereas others which were included in the same pardon are exiled or put to death, the speech would be proper, and in its kind truly causal, if we should say, the one part submitted themselves and craved allowance of their pardon, whereas the other stood out and rejected it. For it is to be presumed, that no prince being able to quell his rebellious adversaries will suffer any to enjoy the benefit of a general pardon (how freely soever it be granted) unless they submit themselves unto it, and crave the

benefit of it, with such humility as becomes malefactors or men obnoxious; much less will he restore any to blood, or advance them to dignities, whom he knows or suspects still to continue ill-affected or disloyal in heart. So then the not-submission, or continuance in rebellion, is the true and positive cause why the one sort enjoy no benefit of the general pardon, but are more severely dealt withal for rejecting the prince's grace than they should have been dealt withal if no pardon had been granted. The humble submission of the other, and their penitence for their former misdeeds, is *causa sine qua non;* that is, a necessary means or condition, without which the prince (how gracious soever) would not suffer them to enjoy the benefit of their pardon, would not restore them to their blood, would not advance them to greater dignities.

This is the very case of Adam and all his sons. All of us were traitors and rebels against the great God and King of heaven, who is better able to quell the whole host of mankind than any prince his meanest rebellious subjects; yet it pleased him to pardon us more freely than any earthly magistrate can do a malefactor. If then the reason be demanded, why any of mankind are saved, why they are restored unto their blood, and advanced to greater dignity than Adam in paradise enjoyed; no other true cause can be assigned of these effects besides the mere grace and mercy of the Almighty Judge.

But if it be further demanded, why some of mankind enjoy the benefit of this pardon, and inherit eternal life, why others are sentenced to everlasting death, whenas the free pardon, with its benefits, were seriously and sincerely tendered to all, the answer is orthodoxal and true; because some in true humility accepted of the pardon, and craved allowance of it;

whereas others rejected it, and slighted such proclamations or significations of it as the God of mercy and compassion had given out, not to this or that man only, but to all the world. So that the omission of those good works which our Saviour mentions in the final sentence is the true cause why the wicked are excluded from all benefit of it. The performance of
560 the same works (as feeding of the hungry, visitation of the sick, &c.) is the instrumental cause, or means subordinate to the principal cause, why Christ's sheep are suffered or admitted to enjoy the benefit of the same free pardon; but no cause at all why the pardon was proclaimed, or why the kingdom of heaven was prepared for them; for that was prepared for them from the foundation of the world, before they had any actual being, before they could merit any thing at the hands of men, much less at the hand of God, either *de congruo* or *de condigno;* for all merit supposeth some precedent work, and every work or operation presupposeth actual being.

The freeness of the pardon excludes not all qualification, but rather requires sincere performance of good duties.

7. But how freely soever the general pardon be issued out, or the kingdom of heaven be either promised or really bestowed, (and it is as freely bestowed or given as it is promised,) the free gift, or bestowing of it, is so far from excluding all qualifications in the parties on whom it is freely bestowed, that it necessarily requires a sincere performance of those good duties which are specified in the final sentence; *Come, ye blessed of my Father; for I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat,* &c. Now if to suffer stubborn malefactors to enjoy the benefit of a gracious pardon cannot stand with the majesty of an earthly prince, much less can it stand with the infinite majesty of the Eternal Judge to permit impenitent sinners to enjoy the benefit and the full redemption purchased by Christ, or to inherit

the kingdom of heaven; both because no unclean thing can enter there, and because as the redemption is a redemption from the service of sin to the service of righteousness; so the pardon is only a pardon to such as repent, and forsake the sin pardoned. This answer to their latter topic, or frame of arguments, (for our admission into eternal life,) drawn from the causal form of speech, will bring forth a punctual answer to the other general head or root of arguments taken from those places of scripture wherein it is said that we are accounted worthy of eternal life.

For in all the places alleged by them, this phrase or form of speech, *to be worthy*, includes no more than to be so qualified as we shall not be accounted unworthy of God's mercy or free pardon through Jesus Christ. All that shall enter into the kingdom of heaven must be such as *Deus dignabitur;* that is, such as God shall vouchsafe or deign to accept in mercy, or not account altogether unworthy of his free pardon purchased by the merits of Christ, or of the benefits of it, which are always actually bestowed, not only for Christ's merits, but in Christ and through Christ, that is, as freely bestowed without any merits of ours as they were first promised.

The Greek writers (especially their ecclesiastic writers, who most accurately follow the true sense and character of the New Testament, which was first written in Greek) accurately distinguish betwixt μὴ ἄξιος, and ἀνάξιος, and οὐκ ἄξιος. To this purpose there is an ecclesiastic canon in the Greek church which commends the ingenuity of such as shall acknowledge themselves to be μὴ ἄξιοι, that is, as we say, *not worthy* of the dignities whereto they are preferred; but if any man should say he were ἀνάξιος, that is,

unworthy of such preferment, the canon takes it as a presumption that he is not to be admitted unto it, or as a part of conviction that he deserves to be deprived of it. Now to be οὐκ ἄξιος, in the language of the Holy Ghost, is somewhat more than to be ἀνάξιος, that is, to be in *nowise worthy* of the preferment which he seeks for or enjoys. This is the phrase which Paul and Barnabas use unto the stubborn Jews, Acts xiii.
561 46: *But seeing you put the word of God from you, and judge yourselves to be* unworthy (οὐκ ἀξίους) *of eternal life, lo, we turn unto the Gentiles.* These Jews then, to whom they spake, were unworthy, that is, altogether uncapable of eternal life, whereof the Gentiles were, in this sense, thus far worthy, that they were not altogether uncapable of that free mercy and pardon which was first tendered to the Jews. And this exclusion of the Jews, and admission of the Gentiles unto everlasting life, or unto the means or pledges of it, was but the accomplishment of our Saviour's parable, Matt. xxii. 8: *Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy.* And it is worth your noting, that in two of cardinal Bellarmine's forecited allegations, the one Luke xx. 35, the other 2 Thess. i. 4, 5, is said, not such as *are worthy*, but such as shall be or *are accounted worthy* of everlasting life; that is, such as shall be so accounted or accepted, not for their own sake, or for their merits, but so accounted and accepted for and through the merits of Christ, or for his imputed righteousness; for to say, that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, is all one as to say, his righteousness shall go upon our account, or that we shall not be uncapable of his merits; for the word *to impute* is as much (in strict propriety of speech) as to be admitted upon an

account. Thus much of the objections made by the Romish church, and of the answers unto them, which was the first general proposed.

Works not properly meritorious, but indeed unworthy of eternal life.

8. The second was, the confirmation of the doctrine jointly maintained by all reformed churches, which (for the present) we shall confirm from one place of scripture only, (besides the words of the text, Rom. vi. 23,) and that is, Rom. viii. 18: *I reckon* (saith the apostle, or I give it up as upon an account) *that the sufferings of this present time are* not worthy, οὐκ ἄξια, *to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us.*

If any works of men regenerate were meritorious, or worthy of eternal life, these, by our adversary's confession, should be the sufferings of holy martyrs, specially of such glorious martyrs as St. Paul was; yet these he saith are not worthy to be compared unto, or are of no worth in respect of the glory that shall be revealed in us.

But if the precious names of those in Sardis, that is, the saints there, were to walk with God because they were worthy, how shall the sufferings of St. Paul or of St. Peter be held unworthy, οὐκ ἄξια, in nowise worthy, or most unworthy of the glory which was to be revealed in them? for this includes as much, if not somewhat more, than to walk with Christ.

The answer is ready; The sufferings of the saints were not unworthy in respect of God's free grace or mercy; not unworthy of enjoying the benefit of his free pardon; for all shall be excluded from it that are unworthy of it.

But the grievous and most patient sufferings of the apostles themselves are here adjudged by our apostle to be altogether unworthy of the glory that shall be revealed, in respect of God's justice: or if he should

enter into judgment with them after these three branches of grace, faith, hope, and charity, had fructified in them.

But have they no answer to this objection? Yes; cardinal Bellarmine (the only man which ever that church had for traversing the testimony or verdict of scriptures alleged by our writers) hath two in store, or rather two branches of one and the same answer. His answer in general is this; That our apostle in
562 this place, Rom. viii. 18, doth speak of the substance of works done by just and holy men, not of the absolute proportion between them and the glory which shall be revealed. If we respect the substance of their works, they are not equal (for the one is momentary or temporal, and the other eternal) to the reward or gift of God, which is eternal life or glory; yet, saith he, there is a true or just proportion between them.

9. To put a colour upon this distinction, he gives instance, first, in the sufferings of our Saviour, which were but temporary, and no way comparable for duration of time with the everlasting pains of hell, which without his sufferings we all should have suffered; and yet his temporary sufferings did make a full and just satisfaction for the sins of men, which deserved everlasting torments. For what was wanting to the duration or continuance of his sufferings was supplied by the dignity of his person which suffered them; in like sort, (as he would have it,) the worth or dignity of that charity, from which the sufferings of martyrs or other good works of just and holy men do proceed, may make up that defect which they apparently have in respect of their short duration or continuance.

His second instance is, that the pleasures or contentments of sin are in nowise comparable to the everlasting torments of hell, which yet these momentary

pleasures justly deserve, for the contempt of God and his commandments; and thus (as he would have us believe) the good works of saints, though but few and short, may, through the virtue of grace or charity, as justly deserve eternal glory.

How Christ's temporal sufferings were of infinite merit.

10. But as his answer in general is sophistical, so the instances which he brings to prove it are most impertinent, and, if they be well scanned, most pregnant for us against him.

To the first we reply, as all divines agree, that Christ's sufferings, though but temporary for duration, and for quality not infinite, did make a full satisfaction for the sins of mankind, because the person of the sufferer was truly and absolutely infinite; his satisfaction, or the value of his sufferings, was truly infinite, *non quia passus est infinita, sed quia passus est infinitus;* "not because he suffered infinite pains, but because he who suffered those grievous and unknown pains was truly infinite." But neither the persons of the saints which suffered martyrdom, nor any pains which they suffered, or good works which they did, had any just proportion to infinity; and therefore could not be meritorious of eternal glory (which is for duration infinite) either in respect of their persons or of their charity, which questionless was much less than Christ's love and charity towards us, as man, though this was not so absolutely infinite as the love and charity of his Godhead. So that this instance is not only impertinent, but altogether unadvised; and the reader may well wonder how such gross and somnolent incogitancy could possibly surprise so wary a man, so great a scholar, as cardinal Bellarmine was.

Why the pleasures of sin, though temporary, deserve eternal punishment.

His second instance, though it include no such gross incogitancy as the former, nevertheless it is involved in an error, too common, not only to the Romanist,

but to many in reformed churches. For the pleasures of sin, though but temporary, deserve eternal death; (betwixt which and them (in themselves considered) there is no just proportion;) but the true reason why they justly deserve this death, is, because men, by continuing in sin, and by following the pleasures of it, do reject or put from them the promises of eternal life, betwixt which and everlasting death there is a just
563 proportion. And when life and death everlasting are proposed unto us, the one out of mercy, the other out of justice, it is most just dealing with God, to give such as choose the pleasures of sin before the fruits of holiness, the native issue of their choice; but it could not have stood with the justice of God to have punished our first parents' transgression with everlasting death, unless out of his free bounty and liberality he had made them capable, not of a temporal only, but of an everlasting life.

But now that Adam hath sinned, and made himself and his posterity subject unto everlasting death, doth not this original sin, or every actual sin which issueth from it, deserve everlasting death?

Yes, they do; and would inevitably bring death upon all, without intervention of God's mercy or free pardon made in Christ. But this free pardon being presupposed, and being proclaimed unto the world, it is not sin original, or the positive sins of men in themselves considered, which bring everlasting death upon them, but their wilful neglect or slighting of God's mercy promised in Christ, (or of the means which God affords them for attaining this mercy,) which leaves them without excuse or apology, or which makes up the full measure of their iniquity.

This is our Saviour's doctrine, John iii. 17: *God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world,*

but that the world through him might be saved. From what original then doth the condemnation of the world proceed? Our Saviour tells us, ver. 19, *This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.* It is not then the works of darkness in themselves considered, but considered with men's love unto them or delight in them, that doth induce a neglect or hate of light, which brings condemnation upon the world. Now if the works of darkness, or pleasures of sin, which are but momentary, do not in themselves procure everlasting death, albeit they proceed from sin original, much less shall the good works of God's saints, albeit they proceed from grace, procure or deserve everlasting life; for the grace by which we do them is from God, not from ourselves; but the evil works which we do are our own, God hath no share in them. So that the height or accomplishment of sin consists in the neglect or contempt of eternal life; and the neglect hereof could not be so heinous, if this life could be deserved by us, or if it were awarded to us out of justice, not out of mere mercy and grace.

11. This difference betwixt the title, which bad works have to death, and the want of title, which the best works have to life everlasting, is most significantly expressed by St. Paul, Rom. vi. 23—*The wages of sin is death*, saith he; and wages are merited, are never detained without some interruption of the course of justice; but *eternal life* is not the wages of holiness, but *the gift of God.* And if in any sort it might be deserved or merited, the apostle, questionless, would have said it had been, if not ὀψώνια, *the wages*, yet μισθὸς, *the reward* of holiness. But inasmuch as this word *reward* sometimes includes *ratio-*

nem dati, something given as well as taken, not always a reward of mere bounty, therefore the apostle doth not say it is the *reward of holiness*, or the *reward of God;* nor doth he say it is δῶρον, which properly signifies *a gift;* for gifts, though freely given in kindness, and not by covenant, may be mutual, and may include a kind of merit *de congruo*, as we say, one kindness requires another like; but our apostle, to prevent this conceit of merit, useth a word which, in its true and proper signification, is incompatible with the conceit of merit; he calleth *life eternal* χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, as the vulgar Latin renders it, *gratia Dei*, "the grace of God."

564

CHAP. XXVIII.

ROMANS VI. 23.

..... but the gift of God (or the grace of God) *is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.*

Whether charismata divina, *that is, the impressions of God's eternal favour may be merited by us; or whether the second, third, and fourth grace, and life eternal itself, may be so. About revival of merits. The text, Heb.* vi. 10, God is not unjust, &c. *expounded. The questions about merits and about justification have the same issue. The Romish doctrine of merit derogates from Christ's merits. The question (in order to practice or application) stated betwixt God and our own souls. Confidence in merit, and too hasty persuasion that we be the favourites of God, two rocks. God, in punishing godly men, respects their former good works.*

Of the word *gift* or *grace.*

1. THE *gift* or *grace of God.* This word *grace* is sometimes taken for *the favour of God*, which in the Greek is χάρις; sometimes it implies the *stamp or impression of this favour* in us; and this, in the Greek, is expressed by the word χάρισμα, used here by St. Paul; that *the favour of God* cannot be *me-*

rited by any works of man, is out of question; for it was the favour *or free grace of God* which gave our first parents being, which continues their posterity here on earth; and neither our first parents nor any of their posterity could deserve or merit their being. This *favour of God* is, as he is, without beginning, without change; but so is not τὸ χάρισμα, which is the impression or effect of this eternal favour in us. It hath no being in us before we be; and after it be inherent in us, it admits of alteration or change in us.

The question then is, Whether the effects or impressions of God's eternal favour to us may be deserved or merited by us; or, seeing the degrees or parts of grace inherent be many, it is controversed between the Romish church and us, Whether any parts of this grace can be deserved or merited by us.

Whether the grace of God, or the effects of his eternal favour, can be merited by us.

That the first grace (that is, the first stamp or impression of God's favour towards us) cannot be merited by us, they grant; for the first grace (as some of them say) is *fundamentum meriti*, "the foundation or groundwork of all merits:" *Et fundamentum meriti non cadit sub merito;* "Every merit is precedent to the thing merited:" but there can be no merit precedent to the first grace, which is the root, the ground or original of all merits; but the second, third, or fourth grace, or degrees of grace, may (in their divinity) be merited through the virtue or excellency of the first grace, or first degree of grace, so we use that as we should.

Between the first degree or seed of grace sown in our hearts by the finger of God, and the full growth or increase of it, there is, as cardinal Bellarmine allegeth, a true proportion, though no equality; and therefore there may be some ground of merit for the increase of grace, though not for the first beginning

of it. Indeed if grace did grow in us as trees or plants do from the first seed, without any great care or ope-
565 ration of him that plants them, and if it did thus grow without any interruption or default on our parts, there might be some pretence for merit, or some probability, at least, that the fruits of grace so growing should be ours, or so far ours as we are ourselves, because we are the soil wherein the first seeds of grace were sown. But if it be God, not we ourselves, that gives the increase; if it be God that sends Paul to plant, and Apollos to water the seeds which he hath sown in us; if it be he that made us, and not we ourselves; all the fruits of grace are his by propriety, not ours, but only so far as he shall suffer us to enjoy them, by continuance of the same gracious undeserved favour by which he hath made us, and by which he sows the first seeds of grace in us.

2. But grace (being sown or planted in us by his immediate hand, without any cooperation on our parts)

non —— Crescit occulto velut arbor ævo—

Hor. Carm. I. xii. 45.

doth not grow up in us, as well-thriving plants out of their proper seed, without ceasing or interruption, though by degrees unsensible; for sometimes it decreaseth; ofttimes it suffers many interruptions in its growth by our default or negligence. And is it possible that we should deserve or merit the increase or fruits of that grace, whose growth (in spring) is ofttimes blasted or hindered through our negligence or wilful default? This they do not say; this in congruity of reason they cannot say who deny that grace once implanted in us cannot be displanted, can admit no intercision in its substance or being, however it may admit interruptions in its growth, or some decay or waning. But

the Romish church, with her advocates, willingly grant, That grace truly inherent in men, and inherent in such perfect measure as enables them to fulfil the moral law of God, may be utterly lost, may be expelled by mortal or deadly sin; and yet may be recovered again, but lost or expelled it cannot be without the default or negligence, without some mortal default or negligence of him who had it in his custody. And yet being so lost, they hold the like grace may be gotten again; and the grace so gotten and recovered they call the second grace; and if it be twice lost, and so recovered, it is the third grace. The question then is, how the second, third, and fourth grace is or may be recovered by us; whether by way of merit or desert, or only of God's free mercy and favour.

The first grace being lost, (though lost it cannot be without their default that had it,) the second grace (in their divinity) may be merited *de congruo*, "in congruity." And this is a strange tenet, that seeing the first grace cannot be merited by any works of ours, either *de condigno* or *de congruo*, (that is, either out of the true worth of our works, or out of any congruity or proportion which is between them and grace,) the second grace should be at all merited, when the grace which is the foundation of this merit is utterly lost; this is all one as if they should say, the fruit may be good or fair, when the root or tree which bears it is dead; or that the roof may stand, when the foundation is taken from it; or that any accident may remain without a substance; yet thus to hold they are enforced, if they will speak consequently to their other tenets or positions concerning the merit of works done out of grace or charity. For many of their arguments which they bring for confirmation of their merits in general, do either conclude, that the second

grace may be merited or awarded by the course of God's justice, not of mercy only; or that the apostasy into which they should otherwise fall, may be prevented by the virtue or efficacy of their former works of charity; or else they conclude nothing at all for any merit.

566 3. The especial, or (as some think) the only place of scripture which can with probability be alleged for the revival of merits, after the grace, from which these merits did spring, is utterly extinguished, is that Heb. vi. 9: *But, beloved, we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation, though we thus speak.* In the former verses the apostle had threatened them with the danger of that irremissible sin, which they call the sin against the Holy Ghost, into which no man can fall but by forsaking the works of his *first love.*

What then is the reason that our apostle doth hope so well of these backsliding Hebrews?

He grounds his hopes, (as the advocates for the Romish church contend,) not so much upon God's free mercy or favour, by which only the first grace was bestowed upon them, as upon God's justice; and if his hopes be grounded upon God's justice more than upon his free mercy or favour, then the recovery of their former estate, or the prevention of that apostasy into which they were falling, was more from the merit of their former works, than from God's free mercy or grace. Now that the apostle did ground his hopes of their recovery upon God's justice, they take it as proved from the tenth verse: *For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed towards his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.* These words seem to import, that if God at this time should

God's justice and righteousness in re-

have cast them off, he had not been just and right in his judgments; and if it had been any injustice in God at this time utterly to have forsaken them, then their perseverance in such grace as was left them for the recovery of such grace as they had lost was out of merit or desert, and perhaps meritorious of the recovery; for every man doth deserve or properly merit that which without injustice or unrighteousness cannot be detained from him. This is the most plausible argument which they bring for the revival of merits after grace be lost or decayed; and if merits may revive after grace be lost, then, questionless, whiles grace continues without interruption or intercision, men may merit more degrees or increase of the same grace, and so, finally, everlasting life, which is here said to be the grace of God.

warding us does not imply the merit of our works.

I have been bold to put this argument, drawn from our apostle, Heb. vi, as far home as any advocate for the Romish church hath done or can do, because the true and punctual answer unto it will easily reach all other arguments which they can draw from the like head or topic, as when it is said, *God shall reward us in righteousness*, or as a righteous Judge, &c.

4. To this place I answer, that the word δίκη in Greek, or *justitia* in Latin, doth sometimes import *strict or legal justice*, as it is opposed to mercy, favour, or lovingkindness. Sometimes again it imports *universal goodness*, or all the branches of goodness. So the heathen had observed, that *justitia in sese virtutes continet omnes*, "that justice universally taken did comprehend all virtues in it." And in this sense, a loving or friendly man is said to be *a just or righteous man*. So the Holy Ghost speaks of Joseph, the betrothed husband of the blessed virgin, *that being a just man, he was not willing to make her an example,*

The divers acceptions of *justice* or *righteousness*.

but was minded to put her away privily; though he found her with child between the time of her espousal and the time appointed for her marriage, yet not with child by himself. Now so long as he was ignorant that she had conceived by virtue of the Holy Ghost, it had been no injustice, but rather a branch of legal
567 justice, to have made her an example, to have had her severely punished; for so the law of God in this case (as he yet understood the case) did not only permit, but seemed to require. And to present a fact punishable by the law of God is always lawful and just; yet this was no part of that justice or righteousness which the Holy Ghost commends in Joseph, when he saith, *he was a just man.* To be *just* then, in his dialect, (in this case) was to be *a loving, a friendly, and favourable man;* and if the Romish church would take *righteousness* in the same sense in those places wherein it is said, that *he shall reward the saints as a righteous Judge,* and crown them with glory, their conceit of merit could find no supportance from those testimonies of scriptures which they most allege for it.

But to the former place in the Epistle to the Hebrews it is further to be noted, that our apostle doth not say there, though it be most true, οὐ γὰρ μὴ δίκαιος; *The God you have to deal withal you cannot say is not just;* but οὐκ ἄδικος, *he is not unjust.*

As there is a great difference between *not worthy* and *unworthy,* so is there betwixt *not just* and *unjust.* When our apostle denies God to be *unjust,* this negative is infinite, and doth include all other branches of God's goodness, besides that justice by which he renders to every man his due; it specially importeth in our apostle's meaning, *his favour or lovingkindness,* or his unwillingness to take the advantages of law or strict justice against these Hebrews; or a willingness

not so much to remember their present misdeeds or backslidings in his justice, as to remember their former works (which were much better than their present) in mercy, favour, and lovingkindness.

5. But whilst they thus contend for the merit of works done by grace, do they not derogate from the merits of Christ, who is the only fountain of all grace?

Should such a thing be, our meriting derogates from Christ's merits.

We say, they do.

But they reply, they do not; but rather magnify the merits of Christ more than we do, who deny the merits of saints; for Christ, as they allege, did not only merit grace for us, but this also, that we by grace might truly merit. Now grace itself, and the merit of grace, is a more magnificent effect of Christ's merits than grace alone.

Here is a double effect of Christ's merits, by their doctrine; whereas we admit but a single one. Thus they reply. But if the one of those two effects which they imagine or conceive doth derogate more (in true construction) from the merits of Christ than the supposal or admission of it can add unto them, we attribute more unto his merits by the admission of one single effect only, to wit, mere grace, than they do by acknowledgment of two, to wit, grace itself, and the merit of grace, in us. But the more we are to merit by grace for ourselves, the less measure of merit we leave unto Christ; for as that which he merited for us is not ours, but his; so that which we merit for ourselves is not his, but ours. The merit of grace supposeth a fulness or fountain of grace; and fountain of grace there is no other but Christ himself; nor is there any fulness of grace but in him only; for *of his fulness* (as the evangelist saith, John i. 16.) *have all we received, and grace for grace*, that is, grace upon grace. Every degree or greater measure of grace which

we receive doth flow alike immediately from the fulness of this inexhaustible Fountain of grace, without any secondary fountain or feeders. Grace doth not grow in us as rivers do, which although they have one main spring or fountain, yet they grow not to any greatness without the help of secondary fountains, or
568 concurrence of many springs or feeders. Grace doth so immediately come from Christ, as the rivers do from the sea; increase of grace doth come as immediately from Christ, as the increase of rivers from rain, or as the increase of light in the waxing moon comes from the sun.

Of justification; the doctrine whereof is corrupted by the doctrine of merit.

6. The state of this question concerning the merits of works comes to the same issue with that other great question concerning justification, as whether it be by faith alone, or by faith and works. The Romish church grants, that we are justified by faith in Christ's blood or merits, *tanquam per causam efficientem*, "as by a true efficient cause," seeing all the grace which we first receive is bestowed upon us for Christ's sake. But they hold withal, that it is the grace which for Christ's sake is bestowed upon us, by which we are formally justified; that is, as water poured into a vessel doth immediately expel the air which was in it before, so the infusion of grace for the merits of Christ doth expel sin, whether original or actual, out of our souls. And this (in their language) is the remission of sins, for the attaining whereof there needs no imputation of Christ's righteousness after grace be once infused.

The formal cause of every thing requires some efficient or agent for the production or resultance of it; but being once produced or existent, it excludes the interposition or intervention of any other cause whatsoever for the production or existence of its formal effect.

To produce heat in the water, it is impossible without the agency or efficiency of fire; but the water being made scalding hot by the heat of fire, will heat or scald the flesh of man or other living creature although it be removed from the fire, although it work only in its own strength or of the heat inherent in it. Thus say the Romanists, that grace cannot be produced in us but by the virtue and efficiency of Christ's merits, but being by them once produced, it doth justify us immediately by the strength and virtue of it inherent in us; and by the same strength and virtue working in us it doth produce its formal effect, to wit, the increase of grace, and lastly eternal life.

But if this doctrine of theirs (so far as it concerns justification, or the remission of sins) were true, then this inconvenience (as I have elsewhere shewed) would necessarily follow, That no man already after this manner justified could say or repeat that petition in our Lord's prayer, *Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us*, without a mockery of God or Christ. For if our sins be formally remitted by the infusion of grace, and if by the infusion of the same grace we be formally justified, the only true meaning of this petition is in true resolution this; 'Lord, make us such, or remit our sins after such a manner, that we shall not stand in need of thy remission or forgiveness of them, or that we shall not stand in need of the mediation of thine only Son;' for if they be remitted immediately by grace, so long as this grace endures, all mediation is superfluous, is impossible.

This inconvenience is further improved by the same doctrine so far as it concerns the merits of works done in charity; and profanes those two other petitions in the same our Lord's prayer, *Thy kingdom come;*

Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven, no less than their doctrine of justification doth that petition, *Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.* For if works done by grace or charity could truly merit eternal life, the effect of all the three petitions should be but this; 'Lord, let thy kingdom of grace so come unto us, Lord, let thy will be so done by us here on earth, that as we have been
569 long debtors unto thee for giving thine only Son to die for our sins, and for the purchasing of the first grace unto us; so let us by this grace be enabled to make both thee and him debtors to us by the merit of this grace, and debtors in no meaner a sum than the retribution or payment of eternal life.' For if that life can be merited by our works, then God doth owe it unto us for our works; and if it be due unto us by merit or by debt, then it is not, as our apostle hath it in this 23d verse, *the gift of God,* or τὸ χάρισμα, as the original hath it, *the grace of God;* the apostle might as well have said, that eternal life was as truly the wages of our righteousness, as death is the wages of our sin.

And so the best scholars in the Romish church do grant he might have said. What then is the reason why he did not say so? Of this they give us this reason: 'Inasmuch,' say they, 'as the first grace, by which we merit the kingdom of heaven, is freely given us without any merit precedent, therefore the kingdom of heaven itself, or eternal life, although it be truly merited, yet is called by our apostle *the gift of God,* not the stipend or wages of God.' In giving this reason they speak very consequently to their former position, that we are justified by Christ only, as by the efficient cause, but immediately and formally justified by grace inherent in us, though merited for us

by Christ. But would to God they would learn at length to speak as consequently to the truth delivered here, Rom. vi. 23, by our apostle, as they do to their own tenets, or to the canon of the Trent council, concerning justification; which tenet or canon neither Calvin nor Chemnitius, which examined that canon, could more punctually have crossed after it was made, than our apostle here in this verse did almost 1500 years before it was made; for he doth not say that *eternal life is the grace of God,* διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν, *for Christ's sake, or for his merit,* which might denote only the efficient cause, but that it is, *the grace of God,* ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ Κυριῷ ἡμῶν, *in or through Jesus Christ our Lord.* This imports not the efficient only, but the immediate and next cause of this *gift of God;* it excludes the interposition or intervention of any causality whatsoever besides Christ.

And thus much here, of the state or issue of the controversy betwixt us and the Romish church concerning merits; the appendix, or second branch whereof, (according to the order proposed in the twenty-seventh chapter, section 1,) was, the state of this very question, 'betwixt God the righteous Judge of all, and our own souls or consciences;' or, if you will, betwixt our consciences and us. And this being rightly stated, will put into our mouths that true confession which every Christian soul must make, so often as it shall become a petitioner unto God who made it.

7. This we know, and all do grant, that God made the first man righteous. Whether this original righteousness were a supernatural grace or no, is a question betwixt us and the Romish church; and it hath been touched by us, if not throughly handled, in the very entrance or beginning of the tenth book. Certain it is, that it was a grace, and either a part of man's

being, (or of our nature, as it was the workmanship of God,) or a grace conferred upon our nature with its first being; and a grace which could no way be merited either *de condigno* or *de congruo*. Their very first being was the mere gift of God; so were all the qualifications and graces wherewith it was indued. Suppose man had continued in this first estate, this had been but a continuance of that free gift of God
570 which was bestowed upon him with his beginning. If he had been advanced or translated to a better or more perfect estate, this likewise had been a new free gift or grace of God, which could not be merited by man; for his very first estate was more worth, than all the labour and endeavours which God required at his hands for the preserving of it; so that he was still indebted unto God as well for every moment or hour of life in such an happy estate, as he was for his first creation; and if he had been advanced to any better estate, this had made him a new debtor unto his Maker—it had been more than a continuance of the former debt. The utmost issue or best effect of all his endeavours could only have made him capable or not unworthy of the continuance of God's favour and grace, which he most freely extends to all that do not make themselves unworthy of them: that the first man then was endowed with grace, this was God's sole work; that he made himself unworthy of this first grace, and so lost it, this was his own work. Yet after he had made himself and his posterity thus unworthy of the first grace, God bestows a second upon him, the grace of redemption; and this grace could not be merited by him; it was a more free gift of God than his first creation was; that was an act or gift of his bounty; this latter was an act of his abundant mercy. Bounty extends itself to such as are not

worthy of it; but mercy reacheth to such as are most unworthy of bounty—to such as deserve the severity of punitive justice. What shall we say then? that the second grace, which was promised to mankind in the woman's seed, though it cannot be merited by any, yet being freely and actually bestowed upon them, may merit the continuance of it, the increase of it, or advancement to a better estate?

8. To be freed from the sentence of death which was denounced against our first parents is an extraordinary grace or blessing of God; and this blessing we all receive by the grace of baptism; and this blessing we all enjoy so long as we continue in grace; and the longer we enjoy this grace or blessing, the more still we are indebted to our gracious God, than they are, which never receive it, which want it.

Now it is not possible that we should merit any thing at God's hands by the long enjoyment of that blessing, which the longer, or in greater measure we enjoy, the more still we are indebted unto him that gives it. To what use or end then doth this grace serve? Only to make us more indebted to God than we were for our natural being? Nay! but to make us see the misery of our first estate better than we could possibly see it whilst we continued in it, and to enable us to make a better and more thankful acknowledgment of our debt to God for all his blessings, than without this grace (or this blessing of redemption) we possibly could do. Let the advocates then of the Romish church extol the excellency of grace unto the skies or heavens, whence it descends, we will not in this contradict them, but only request them to consider, that the more excellent grace in itself is, the greater should their condemnation be that make no better use of it than they do, if God should enter into

judgment with them. And certainly that man hath received but a mean portion or talent of grace, which sees not his accounts to God to be much increased, if God should call him to a strict account for not employing his talent, or not stirring up that grace of God which is in him.

9. But suppose we did stir up this grace, or suffer ourselves to be stirred up by it to good works, to what use or end doth our fruitfulness in good works serve? To this end only, that we may not be found
571 unworthy, either of the continuance of God's gracious favour, or of the continual increase of it.

To acknowledge the first receipt of grace to be the sole work of God, and yet to ascribe in part the increase of it to our own merits, or right use of it, is no more than the Pharisee confessed, when he said, *Lord, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, nor as this publican.* Here was a true acknowledgment that he received this grace (by whose good use he thought himself better than other men) freely from God. But in making this comparison, he gloried as if he had not received it; or as if, having received it, he was not so great a debtor unto God as the publican was, nor liable to the same account for his sins past or present. Questionless this Pharisee had been partaker of better grace, at least of better means of salvation, than the publican had been. And if this conceit of his own worth, in comparison of other men, had not polluted his works, there is no question but that he had been more righteous than the publican, yet the publican went home more justified than the Pharisee; not for the worth of any good works which he had done, but by unfeigned acknowledgment of his own unworthiness, if God should have entered into judgment with him.

That form of prayer or acknowledgment which the publican made would at this day well beseem even those which have received a greater measure of grace than either he or the Pharisee had done; even those which have been more fruitful in good works than both of them were. Or if the publican be no fit person for sanctified men to imitate, certainly the prophet Daniel is a fit one; and yet his confession of his own unworthiness, if God should have dealt in justice with him, was more pathetically humble than the publican's was, Dan. ix. 8, 9: *O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him.* He placeth no part of his confidence in the merit either of his prayer or fasting, which yet were both excellent works proceeding from charity, and excellently performed by him; but how excellently soever these duties be performed by him or any, they neither can merit aught for their own worth in themselves, nor from the virtue of God's promises; for all his promises are promises of mercy; and he that seeks for mercy, though promised by God, must sincerely and seriously renounce all works, even the best works which he hath done; that is, he must disclaim all merit or confidence in works, otherwise he cannot take hold of God's promises of mercy, but soliciteth God to deal in justice with him.

How works are excluded from justification.

10. And yet here I must request the reader to call that to mind, which hath been often inculcated before, that whensoever our apostle excludes all works from justification or election, he is to be understood only of confidence in works, or conceit of merit. He excludes not their presence, but necessarily requires it to our

justification, as to the making of our election sure, he only denies any causal efficiency in them for procuring these or the like blessings of God; least of all, for obtaining of eternal life, unto which good works are most necessary. For our apostle takes it as granted, that we must deny ourselves before we can do any good works; but we must do good works before we can renounce them, and we must renounce them in all our suits and pleas, specially for those blessings
572 which God out of his free grace and mercy promised us. A doctrine, which would to God some late writers of reformed churches had taken into serious consideration, whilst they earnestly pleaded for the free grace of God in our election: for so they would never have taught us—as to my apprehension they do—that our election to eternal life is a more free grace of God than the donation of eternal life itself, than which, as no blessing of God is more great, so none can be more free. But the absolute freedom of the gift doth no way exclude, but rather require some qualifications in the donee: and for this reason it is, that the practice of good works is in special sort required for the attaining of eternal life, because that is the greatest and most free act of grace which the God of mercy hath to bestow upon us: in respect of it our best deeds are most unworthy, and the less worthy they are, the more unfeignedly they are to be renounced: and seeing our apostle, when he excludes works from any plea of mercy, doth only exclude confidence or conceit of merit in them; in whatsoever sense he excludes them from election or justification, he excludes them in an higher degree of the same sense from the donation of eternal life: otherwise that could not be, as our apostle saith, τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the free gift of God.*

11. But as in all other points of controversy betwixt us and the Romish church, so in this specially concerning merits, I am always jealous of both readers and hearers, lest whilst they hear one error refuted, they take occasion to run into the contrary. For preventing this inconvenience in this present point, I must request all in the first place to observe, that both of us fully agree in this general—that God is a rewarder of them that seek him; and no man can truly seek him, but by a true and lively working faith. The question betwixt us is only this; Whether God reward such as seek him according to the rule of justice, or according to the rule of his boundless mercy; or whether our works (his grace and promise presupposed) be worthy of his reward, or only make us not altogether unworthy, or not uncapable, of his mercy.

Two rocks to be avoided here, confidence in merit of works, and premature conceit or presumption of our election.

The second point which I would commend to all men's consideration is this, that as our apostle in the forecited place, Heb. vi, doth not ground his hope of those Hebrews' recovery upon God's justice, so he doth not ground it upon the infallibility or immutable estate of their election. He doth not so much as intimate that they could not possibly fall, because their persons were elected, for this was more than either he or they knew, more than most men can possibly know, more than any man in their case may safely persuade himself. He that makes his personal election the only anchor of his faith, in such temptations as these Hebrews at that time were overtaken with, shall fall into as bad, perhaps a worse error, than if he held that his good works formerly done might merit his recovery unto his former estate, so he will but address himself to do the like.

This conceit of merit (though we take men in their

best estate, or when they are least conscious of grosser sins) is a symptom of heathenish pride or ignorance: for the heathens thought they could make the gods or divine powers beholding unto them. But to stay ourselves, in the consciousness of grievous sins lately committed, upon persuasions of our personal election, is the most dangerous root of hypocritical pride that can be planted in our corrupt nature.

Now any symptom or branch of pride or vainglory is less deadly than the root of pride, vainglory, or
573 Pharisaical hypocrisy. Far be it from any of us to think, that the like sin committed by a man regenerate, doth not deserve worse at God's hands than if it had been committed by an unregenerate or mere natural man, because he thinks himself to be of the number of the elect; for if this sin or transgression be for substance the same, the circumstances make it a great deal worse in a regenerate than in a mere natural man. That saying of the heathen satirist, or censurer of ill manners, holds as true in divinity as in morality:

> Omne animi vitium tanto conspectius in se
> Crimen habet, quanto major, qui peccat, habetur.
>
> *Juven.* Sat. viii. 140.

The crime or fault is so much the greater, by how much the party offending is in his own esteem or others' better qualified.

12. From what original is it then that the righteous Judge doth ofttimes less punish the sins of men which have lived a godly life, than he doth the like sins in men not as yet regenerate, or in men that have been altogether barren of good works? The true resolution of this problem or question must be taken from that general rule or maxim, that God will render to every man according to all his ways, either in justice or in

mercy. Now albeit God always punish the ungodly in this life *citra condignum*, in less measure than they deserve, because his mercy and longsuffering inhibits the execution of his punitive justice, yet he always rewards the good works which we do *ultra condignum*, far above their deservings; for albeit the best works which we can do deserve no reward at all, yet his infinite goodness will not suffer the least good works which we do to go without his reward. Rewarded we shall be, either with some positive blessing, or with the mitigation of some punishment, which our evil works had justly deserved. From this original it is, that albeit the bad works of men regenerate, or endowed with grace, do weigh heavier in the scale of God's justice, than the like works of men unregenerate do, yet they do not sway so much, because whiles he weighs the bad works of men regenerate in the scale of his justice, he weighs the good works which they have formerly done in the scale of his mercy and bounty. But as for such as have lived a lewd and godless life, and have made themselves unworthy of his mercy, their grosser sins are weighed in the scale of his justice without a counterpoise, and therefore do sway the further, and nearer towards hell, albeit for their nature and quality they be not more heinous than some offences of the regenerate. So that God is no accepter of persons, albeit in this life he punisheth the same sin more grievously in one than in another; for this he doth, not with any respect unto their persons, but with respect unto his own mercy, whereof the one sort are capable, the other are altogether unworthy. And this was the true meaning of our apostle, and the ground of his hope or good persuasion of these Hebrews, ch. vi. 9, 10: *But . . . . we are persuaded better things of you, and things that accompany salvation . . . .*

For God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister.

574

CHAP. XXIX.

ROMANS VI. 23.

..... but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Three points. 1. *Eternal life the most free gift of God, both in respect of the donor and of the donee.* 2. *Yet doth not the sovereign freeness of the gift exclude all qualifications in the donees: rather requires better in them than others, which exclude it or themselves from it—(Whether the kingdom of heaven was prepared for all or for a certain number).* 3. *The first qualification for grace is to become as little children. A parallel of the conditions of infants: and of Christians truly humble and meek.*

1. THE points remaining to be handled are three: the first is in part touched before; that eternal life is not only *the gift of God*, or, as the Vulgar renders the original, *gratia Dei*, but τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, *the gift of God*; κατ' ἐξοχὴν, that is, as if you would say, *the gift of gifts, the greatest gift*, and *the freest gift*, that God hath to bestow on mankind for, in, or through Christ Jesus our Lord. The second, that the absolute freedom or graciousness of this gift doth not exclude all qualifications of works or inclinations to good works, but only confidence in works.

The third, is the qualification required in all such as hope to receive this gift; or the manner how they are to work out their own salvation, that they may be capable, or at least not totally uncapable of this free gift.

To the first, that eternal life is the gift of gifts, or

the most free or gracious gift that God hath to bestow on man, may be easily proved from the conditions required in a free gift. And these are two. The first respects the estate or condition of the donor, as that he be not tied by any necessity, either natural, moral, or politic, to bestow his benevolence. The second condition respects the donee; and it is *absentia*, if not *carentia meriti;* being without, if not a want of desert or merit: in both respects life eternal is τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, the most excellent and most undeserved gift that can be given. Eternal life a most free gift of God.

That it is freely given without any constraint or tie of necessity is clear; for no operations of the most holy and blessed Trinity, besides the eternal generation of the Son of God, and the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost, have any natural necessity in them. These be operations of the divine nature: all extraneous things are works of God's divine will and pleasure. God, who worketh all things, worketh all things else according to the counsel of his will; that is, he so worketh them, he so preserveth and ordereth them, as it was free for him from eternity not to make them, not to preserve them, not so to order them, as he doth. He was when the world was not, and might so have continued. And this clearly evinceth that there was no natural necessity why he should create the world, or any thing in it; for so the world should have been as he is, eternal, without beginning. Nor was there any moral necessity that he should create the world, or man, or angel; for none could have impeached him of injustice or unkindness, or of other transgression of any law or rule, if he had never given them such being as they have. Nor was there any politic necessity that he should create the world, or

575 man, or angel, in whose creation he had no respect to any private end; he gained nothing by their being; the best of them are but unprofitable servants.

God's infinite freedom.

2. It was free then for God to create or not to create man; but as it was his pleasure to create him, so it was necessary that man being created by him, he should be created good and righteous. Suppose then the first man had continued in his first estate, that is, righteous and good, his righteousness could have merited nothing of God, much less eternal life. It was as free to God to have annihilated him, or to have resolved him into nothing, as it was to make him of nothing. Indeed to have punished him with everlasting death, unless he had wilfully, and through his own default, lost his original righteousness, could not have stood with the righteousness or goodness of God. There was a moral necessity that his Creator should not punish him with everlasting death, unless he had transgressed his law, and made himself unworthy of everlasting life. But the first man did wilfully and freely (that is, without any necessity) transgress the law of his God, and make himself and his posterity unworthy of eternal life. That God upon this transgression did not instantly punish him with everlasting death, this was an act of the free grace and mercy of God: thus he might have done without any impeachment to his justice, without any disparagement to his goodness.

That unto man thus ill deserving he made a promise of redemption, and of restitution to a better estate than he lost, this was an act of his mercy and gracious goodness; a more free act than his first creation; for that was not deserved, and therefore free; but not so free as the promise of his redemp-

tion, after he had justly deserved the contrary, to wit, condemnation unto everlasting death. But this promise of redemption through the woman's seed being freely made, is not the performance of it on God's part necessary? is he not bound by promise to bestow his grace on all them to whom he promised redemption? Though he be debtor unto no man, yet he is faithful in himself, and cannot deny himself, or not perform what he hath promised. It is true, if the parties to whom he promiseth do so demean themselves as they should, or as by the second covenant they stand bound. But who is he can make this plea with God? Who is he that can truly say, there was any necessity at that time when the promise was made to our first parents in the woman's seed, that he should be begotten or born, or that he was such a child of promise, from the time of Adam's fall, as Isaac was? And if there were no necessity then that he should be born, what necessity is there that he should be partaker of grace after he is born? or what necessity is there, that after the grace of baptism received he should come to be of the number of the elect? No man can plead any worth or merit in himself for the receiving of grace; or any necessity whereby God is tied by promise or otherwise to bestow grace or perseverance in grace upon him in particular.

The true way of laying hold on general promises.

These and the like favours must still be sought for by the prayer of faith; that is, by unfeigned acknowledgment of our own unworthiness, and of God's free mercy, not only in making the first decree concerning man's redemption, but in continual dispensing the effects of the same decree, or the means of our salvation: this is the only way to lay hold upon the general promise.

3. It was no contradiction in cardinal Bellarmine, (as some conceive it,) after he had strongly disputed for merit of works, thus to conclude, *Tutissimum est* —"It is the safest way to place our confidence in the merits of Christ." This resolution of his will truly
576 infer, that albeit the question concerning merits were doubtful, yet we protestants take the more useful and safer way, and the way which cardinal Bellarmine himself in his devotions, and, as I hope, on his death-bed, did take.

Yet, admit his doctrine concerning merits had been true, indefinitely taken, there had been no contradiction between his premises and conclusion; for many things which are unquestionable in *thesi*, or in the general, are doubtful or uncertain in *hypothesi*, when we come to make particular application. This doctrine is most true in *thesi*, 'That God is faithful in all his promises,' that 'he cannot deny himself,' or 'falsify his promise;' yet it is not safe for thee or me thus to infer, that 'God cannot deny eternal life to us in particular,' because he hath promised it as sincerely to thee or me as to any others: the absolute and unchangeable fidelity of God will not infer (how strongly soever we believe it) that either thou or I are faithful for the present, or shall continue faithful unto the end, or until our final victory over the devil, the world, and the flesh; which is the true importance of this phrase, *to the end*, in many places of scripture.

It follows not, God cannot deny himself; *ergo*, I am in, and shall persevere in the state of salvation.

Now God's promise of eternal life is not immediately terminated to any man's person or individual entity, but unto such as continue faithful unto the end, or unto such as overcome; as you may observe in many places of scripture, especially in the second and third chapters of the Revelation of St. John. Now

it is a great deal more easy for a man to assure himself that he is faithful for the present, or victorious in respect of instant temptations, than to assure himself that he shall continue victorious in respect of temptations that may befall him. And yet in respect of the deceitfulness of our own hearts, it is not safe for most men to make it as an article of their faith, or point of absolute belief, that they are so faithful for the present, as that God cannot deny eternal life unto them, though not in respect of their merits, yet in respect of his promise, if they should instantly depart this life; so that such as have as full and perfect interest in the promises of God as others have, may forfeit their interest, as well by immature persuasions or presumptions, that they are of the number of the elect, as by conceit of merit or confidence in works. Both persuasions are dangerous, because both prejudice the free mercy and grace of God in bestowing eternal life, or in dispensing the means required unto it. The Romish church saith, it was free for God to give us grace, (or ability to do the works of grace,) or not to give it; but this grace being freely given, and the works performed, it is not free, but necessary in respect of God's justice, to give eternal life as the reward of works. Others, opposite enough to the papists, say, that it was free for God to elect, or not to elect us unto eternal life: but being elected, it is not free for God to deny eternal life unto us; for this, in their language, were to deny himself, or falsify his promise. Yet, by their leave, if we were thus elected from eternity, it was never free for God to elect or not to elect us: and so eternal life should not be the award of God's free mercy and grace as now present, but an act of his fidelity or promise past, before we had any being, before the world was made. But if

Equally dangerous to confide in merit, and to presume of election.

God had not the same free power at this day to elect or not to elect any man now living, or not the same free power to shew mercy on whom he will, and to harden whom he will, which it is supposed once he had, he should not have the same power over us which the potter hath over his clay, which is at his free disposal, not only before he works it, but while it is in working.

577 I may conclude this point with cardinal Bellarmine's *Tutissimum est*—'It is the safest way, the only way, absolutely to rely all our life-time upon God's free mercy and grace, and to make continual supplications unto God the Father through Christ, that as he hath prepared a kingdom for us from the foundation of the world, so he would prepare and fit us for it:' for without preparation, or fit qualification, we are not capable of it; and thus we come unto the second point proposed.

The free gift of eternal life excludes not due qualifications in the receiver.

4. The second point (to which the third is annexed or subjoined) was, 'That the absolute freedom of this gift doth not exclude all qualifications in the parties on whom it is bestowed, but rather requires better qualifications in them than can be found in others, which exclude it, or make themselves uncapable of it.'

The truth of this assertion you may easily conceive by this one instance or example. Suppose you, that are governors of this corporation[b], should found (as God put it in your hearts to do) a goodly hospital or almshouse at your own proper cost and charges, the gift would be most free, a gracious gift or foundation; and yet no man would conceive that the doors of that house, though most freely founded, should be as open, or the good things belonging to it as free, for thieves

[a] See book 10. chap. 42. [vol. ix. p. 448, &c.]

[b] This was preached at Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

and robbers, for bawds or panders, for sturdy and lazy beggars, as for the halt and lame, for the aged and impotent, or as for men of decayed estate by casualties, as for widows or orphans; not so free or open for persons so qualified, but otherwise haughty and proud, as for widows or for decayed persons, that were pious, humble, modest, and ingenuous. He should wrong you much, that should conceive that you did intend only to have the number filled up, though it were by such as the poet describes, but in a verse somewhat better;

> Qui numeri essent, et fruges consumere nati.
>
> *Hor.* Epp. I. ii. 27.

that is, by persons good for nothing, but only to devour God's blessings. To admit all sorts of people promiscuously into such a foundation, without respect of any good qualification, would be an act of prodigality or impiety, rather than of free bounty or gracious charity. And can you imagine or suspect that the most just and righteous Judge, the only wise immortal God, who requires no more of us than that we should be perfect as he is perfect, that we should be bountiful as he is bountiful, and merciful as he is merciful, doth not more constantly observe the rules of his eternal equity, bounty, and mercy, than we can observe our Saviour's rules, which are but the copy of them, albeit we made this our chief care and only study; thus to do is natural unto him, not so unto us; we cannot imitate the patterns which he sets us, without much difficulty and many interruptions. We may freely bestow our alms or rewards, but we cannot qualify the parties that are to receive them; we may prepare good things for them, but we cannot prepare their hearts to receive them well or worthily. But God doth not only prepare the kingdom of heaven for us, but must also prepare us for it, otherwise, as

our apostle speaks, Heb. iv. 1, we shall come short of the promise which is left us for *entering into his rest.* And no man can come short of the promise, or of the blessings promised, but he that had a true interest in the promise, or he for whom the blessing promised was prepared.

For whom was the kingdom of heaven prepared?

5. What shall we say then, that any for whom the kingdom of heaven was prepared from the foundation of the world shall finally miss of it, or be excluded from it, at the end of the world? so our apostle in the forecited place evidently supposeth.

Was it then prepared for all, or for a certain number?

578 A curious and ticklish question: yet about which if any contention have grown or may grow, this cannot arise but only from the malice, ignorance, or incogitancy of the men which dispute and handle it. For between these two propositions themselves, 'The kingdom of heaven was prepared for all—The kingdom of heaven was not prepared for all,' there is no contradiction, if men would not look upon them through some imperfect logical rules, which hold true only in some cases or subjects: if we should say, 'That the kingdom of heaven was prepared for the selfsame man (St. Peter for example) from eternity, and, 'The kingdom of heaven was not prepared for the same St. Peter from eternity[c],' we should say no otherwise than the Holy Ghost hath taught us. There is no more contradiction between the affirmative and the negative, than if one should say, 'The inhabitants of this town are rich,' 'The inhabitants of this town are not rich, but poor.'

The rule is general, that betwixt an indefinite affirmative and an indefinite negative there is no

[c See book 10. chap. 42. [vol. ix. p. 448, &c.]

contradiction. Now though St. Peter were all his lifetime one and the same individual man for person, if we consider him only as he stands in the predicament of substance, yet he was not all his lifetime one and the selfsame object in respect of God's decree of mercy or judgment, or for the preparation of eternal life. To affirm this, were to contradict the Holy Spirit, whose unquestionable maxim it is, that God renders to every man according to all his ways. Now if St. Peter's ways and works were not at all times the same, he was not at all times the same individual object of God's decree. God had one award for him whilst he denied his Master, or dissuaded him from undergoing the cross for us; and another award for him whilst he resolutely confessed Christ before princes, though certain to undergo the cross himself for so doing.

6. But where doth the Spirit of God teach us this logic, or thus to distinguish? Matt. xx. 23, Mark x. 40. The story is plain, save that the one evangelist saith, It was *the mother of Zebedee's children;* the other saith, that *the sons* themselves (to wit, John and James) came with this petition unto our Saviour, that *the one might sit on the right hand, the other on his left hand, in his kingdom.* And it is plain out of St. Matthew, that the petition was as well exhibited by the sons as by the mother; as it is likewise plain by our Saviour's reply, and his interrogation: *Ye know not,* saith he, *what ye ask: to drink of the cup whereof he did drink, and to be baptized with the baptism wherewith he was baptized,* he grants was possible for them, though perhaps in another sense than they conceived when they answered his interrogatory: however, *to sit on his left hand, or on his right hand,* as he *finally con-*

cludes, *was not his to give, but was to be given to them for whom it was prepared by his Father.*

But hence ariseth a dilemma, captious at the first sight; for if the kingdom of heaven were prepared for these two apostles, then it was his to give them; for he must give it to them for whom it is prepared; and so he gave it to the thief upon the cross: or if the kingdom of heaven were not *prepared* for them *from the beginning of the world,* they might not, they could not enter into it. What shall we say then, that James and John did never enter the kingdom of heaven? God forbid! the very phrase and character of our Saviour's speech, and the circumstance of the text, should (methinks) call that logical distinction to any man's mind that had ever learned it, or known it before, if not teach such as knew it not to make it;

579 the distinction, I mean, of *sensus divisus* and *compositus*, which indeed is the only distinction for resolving many difficulties in divinity, for the resolution of which many other impertinent and unartificial ones have been and are daily sought out. The meaning of the distinction in this particular is this; 'If we consider James and John with their present qualifications, it is true that the kingdom of heaven was not prepared for them, they could not enter in at the straight gate that leads unto it, until their present swelling humour of secular ambition or pride was assuaged; for God from eternity had excluded pride and ambition from any inheritance in the kingdom of his Son. But this bad habit or disposition being laid aside, and the contrary, (wherewith as yet they were not invested,) to wit, true humility, being put upon them, the kingdom of heaven was prepared for them, and prepared for them thus qualified from the foundation of the world.' Our Saviour's answer unto them imports no more than

Humility a necessary qualification.

St. Peter doth, when he saith, *Deus dat gratiam humilibus, sed resistit superbis—God giveth grace to the humble, but resisteth the proud;* and so our Saviour repels their petition for the present, because it did proceed from secular pride: and from this particular took occasion not only to teach James and John, but the other ten also, the necessity of humility, as a qualification without which no man shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, either into the kingdom of grace in this life, or into the kingdom of glory in the life to come.

7. For albeit the other ten did much mislike this ambitious humour of James and John, yet (as one observes) that *Diogenes calcavit fastum Platonis cum majori fastu:* so the ten apostles bewray more than a spice of the like ambitious humour in themselves, by the manner of their mislike or indignation at the petition of James and John. Unwilling they were to give place and precedence unto them, albeit they were their Lord and Master's kinsmen: *When the ten heard it,* saith St. Matthew, xx. 24—28, *they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.* The same lesson had been taught them twice before, as, Mark ix. 34—37: *By the way they had disputed among themselves, who should be the greatest. And he sat down, and called the twelve, and saith unto them,*

If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last of all, and servant of all. And he took a child, and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me. This admonition you see doth equally concern all the twelve, not James and John alone. The tenor of the admonition is this; that no man is fit for the kingdom of heaven, unless he become as a child, unless he receive it as a child; that is, unless they better affect a humble and childish disposition, as well in themselves as in others, than any preeminence or worldly dignity. Thus much our Saviour expressly taught them, Mark x. 13—16: *They brought young children to him, that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.* Thus he treated them, not with reference to their individual persons, but to their qualifications; hereby giving his disciples to understand, that all such as seek to be actually blessed by him, whatsoever their parentage or other prerogatives be, they must be so qualified as these children were; not so qualified, they are not capable of the kingdom of heaven. We must so demean ourselves towards our heavenly Father out of knowledge and deliberation, as little children do themselves towards their earthly parents out of simplicity or instinct

The third point.

The qualification for receiving this free gift.

of nature. In respect of malice towards God or man we must be as little children, but in knowledge of our own infirmities, or more than childish impotency, we must be men.

8. To parallel the conditions or properties of little children by nature with the properties of the children of God by supernatural grace. The very impotency of little children, whilst they learn to go, includes a power, at least a proneness to fall, though it be in the sink or channel; but no power at all either to raise themselves, or to make clean their garments from such stain or filth as they have contracted by their fall. In this property we agree too well with them; for, as St. Austin saith, *Sufficit sibi liberum arbitrium ad malum, ad bonum non:* We have a liberty or freedom of will to defile our garments by falling or backsliding after baptism, but no freedom of will, no power of ourselves to rise again unto newness of life. The knowledge, wherein we must in this case exceed little children, must be out of the consciousness of this our impotency or infirmity, to frame our petitions unto God with the prophet, psalm li. 2: *Wash me throughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin:* and again, vv. 10, 11: *Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy spirit from me.*

Again, little children, though they be set upon their feet after their fall, they are not able to stand upright, although they adventure not to go, unless they be supported by their nurses or other helper; and it is our apostle's advice unto *such as stand*, to *take heed lest they fall.*

But is this circumspection in their power after grace

received? No; no more than it is in the power of little children to keep themselves from falling.

To what end then doth this admonition serve? To make us more careful, by the knowledge of this our infirmity, continually to use that or the like prayer, "Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help."

If we truly acknowledge ourselves to be but little children, we cannot but know, that without his preventing grace we must still wallow in our natural filthiness and uncleanness; that without his concomitant grace we cannot stand; and that without his subsequent grace we can make no progress towards eternal life: all our doings must be begun, must be continued, and ended in him by his grace, otherwise we shall fail of the end here proposed unto us by our apostle.

Again, little children are sensible of hunger or want of food, yet cannot provide it, cannot be their own carvers of it, cannot take it, unless it be reached unto them. We then become in some degree the children of God, when we feel a want of spiritual food, or when we hunger and thirst after righteousness; but power we have none after grace received to give satisfaction to this hunger and thirst after good things: the best knowledge that in this case we have, is to beg food
581 convenient at our heavenly Father's hands, in that or the like form of prayer, *Give us this day our daily bread;* and thus to beg it out of full assurance, that he is more ready to hear our requests, than any earthly father is to give his children bread, or any earthly mother to give her sucking infants milk when they cry for it; for some mothers are unnatural, others

may forget their children; but so will not God forget his, so they be children in malice, not in the knowledge of his goodness.

Little children, again, if they be exposed to cold or heat, or any other danger that may accrue from hostile or ravenous creatures, have no power or strength to defend themselves, all that they can do is but to cry for help from others.

Now the spiritual and ghostly enemies of every child of God, and the dangers whereto they daily expose themselves, are more in number than the bodily dangers whereof little children are capable; less able we are, though endowed with some measure of grace, to resist the devil, who goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour, than a sucking child to withstand a bear or wolf that should come upon him. To what end then doth God bestow his grace upon us, if with this we cannot defend ourselves as with a weapon? Only to this end, that we should daily pray for his special protection, as his Son hath taught us: *Lord, lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil*, specially from the author of evil; *for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory.* Thou only art able to subdue and conquer the prince of this world, and to *destroy him who hath the power of death.*

Lastly, albeit we must exceed little children in the acknowledgment of our infirmities, and though our capacities to conceive these and the like forms of prayer be greater than theirs, yet in respect of most particulars we are in this too like little children, that *we know not how to pray*, or ask those things which for the present we stand most in need of. And in this point our knowledge must exceed theirs, that we must have a knowledge of this infirmity, and out of the consciousness of it pray more fervently unto our hea-

venly Father, that he would teach us how to pray, or hear the supplications of his Spirit for us, whose language we perfectly understand not: and not to indent with him for other particulars, but only to grant us what he knows to be best for us, and most available, though not for our present occasions, yet for the attainment of everlasting life. Until we learn this lesson of humility and meekness, which the Son of God himself so often commends unto us by his own example, by precept and instances, we shall find no true rest unto our souls; we shall not have that *full assurance of hope unto the end*, whereof our apostle speaks, Heb. vi.

9. But is this qualification of becoming like little children alone sufficient? No; he that saith, *Whosoever receiveth not the kingdom of heaven as a little child, shall not enter therein*, hath also said, Matt. v. 20, *Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.*

Doth he instance in them as in the most wicked men that were?

So his instance should not have been so pertinent, at least his admonition not so peremptory.

The scribes and Pharisees, if they had not thought so of themselves, were the most righteous men then living; they were the only precisians of those times, and observed many rules of righteousness more exactly than most men now living do any.

582 Wherein then did they come short of the promise? By making extraordinary conscience of some necessary duties, and little or none at all of others.

Why Christ instanceth in the scribes and Pharisees.

The old serpent deceived them, as he doth many Christians to this day, by that fallacy or sophism

which we call *a dicto secundum quid ad simpliciter*, that is, in using their known zealous observance of some good duties, as an argument that they were simply and absolutely more righteous than other men, specially than those whom they saw gross transgressors of some commandments, which they made conscience of. They did acknowledge that they had received many graces from God, for which they thanked him; but yet they gloried, as if they had not received them, and this polluted all their works.

A good man, saith Solomon, *is merciful unto his beast.* This property of good men is in the Turks; for they are more compassionate towards their dogs, more careful for begging them benevolence of strangers and passengers, for feeding them in the open streets, than most Christians are for the relief of their poor brethren; yet is that property of wicked men, which Solomon in the same place describes, more remarkable in them. Their mercies are cruel; for out of this compassionate affection towards dumb creatures they will be ready to kill a Christian man, if he chance to wrong or harm them. It is a good thing then to be zealous of good works; but unless this zeal be uniform, that is, unless it proportionably, if not equally, respect good works of every kind; partial or deformed zeal will bring forth complete hypocrisy. Turkish mercy.

10. But it is an easy matter to tell men that their zeal must be uniform and unpartial; the point wherein satisfaction will be desired is this—how this uniformity of zeal in good works must be wrought and planted in men? This men must learn from that fundamental rule of our Saviour: *Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the Law and the Prophets.* All of us desire or wish, that not this or that man only, but that every

See the discourses following upon that precept, Do as you would be done to.

man should deal justly, friendly, and kindly with us; should think or speak well of us, whilst we do or intend well; should judge charitably of us when they know nothing to the contrary, and censure us charitably if we chance to do amiss. The rule of practice then in brief is this; that we make payment by the same measure by which we borrow; that is, do good, as occasions or abilities serve, to every man, as he is a man, or our fellow-creature; though in more abundant measure unto such as are our Christian brethren, and of the same church and religion. To be charitable in word, in deed, in thought, towards all, even towards such as deserve punishment or censure.

Another branch of the same rule is this; if any have really shewed themselves kind unto us, to do unto them as they have done: if any have dealt rigidly or unkindly with us, not to do as they have done, but as we desired they should have done unto us; for our desires to be well dealt withal are just; but so were not their dealings with us: and why should we make other men's unjust dealing with us, rather than our own just desires of being friendly dealt withal, the rule of our future actions or dealings with the same men? For God will judge us by the former rule, the tenor whereof is this, not to do as we have been done unto, specially if we have been unjustly dealt withal, but to do to every man as we desire they should have done unto us. The same rule may be yet further extended, thus: we must do to every man, not only as we desire that every man should do to us, but
583 as we desire that God should do to us, or for us: so when we pray that God would forgive us our trespasses, we must be ready to forgive them that have trespassed against us. If we desire that God would relieve us in distress, comfort us in sorrow, or succour

us in need, we must be ready to relieve our neighbours in their distress, to succour and comfort them (as we are able) in time of need; not thus (in some good measure) qualified, we do not pray in faith, our prayers are not truly religious; for, as St. James tells us, chap. i. verse the last, *Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.*

CHAP. XXX.

MATTHEW XXV. 34, &c. 41, &c.

Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat, &c... Then shall he say also unto them on the left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed ..... FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger....., sick, and in prison, &c.

Two general heads of the discourse: 1. *a sentence;* 2. *the execution thereof. Controversies about the sentence. Three conclusions in order to the decision of those controversies.* 1. *The sentence of life is awarded* secundum opera, *not excluding faith.* 2. *Good works are necessary to salvation,* necessitate præcepti et medii: *and to justification too,* (*as some say,*) quoad præsentiam, non quod efficientiam. *The third,* (*handled in the next chapter,*) *good works, though necessary, are not causes of, but the way to the kingdom. Damnation awarded for omissions. St. Augustine's saying,* Bona opera sequuntur justificatum, &c. *expounded. St. James* ii. 10, Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, &c. *expounded. Why Christ in the final doom instances only in works of charity, not of piety and sanctity. An exhortation to do good to the poor and miserable; and the rather, because some of those duties may be done by the meanest of men.*

1. THIS portion of scripture is divided by our

Two generals: 1. a sentence, and that twofold; 2. the execution thereof.

Saviour himself into these two generals: the first, a sentence, which for the matter is twofold; *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you*, verse 34, &c. And again, ver. 41, *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.* But many sentences are given which are not put in execution. Yet this being the final sentence that shall be given upon all men, and upon all their works, there is no question but it shall be put in execution. If reason, grounded upon scripture, be not sufficient to enforce our belief, as well concerning the execution of the sentence as the equity thereof, we have an express testimony of the Judge himself for the certainty of this execution, ver. 46, *And these* (to wit, the goats, which were placed on his left hand, that is, all workers of iniquity, or fruitless hearers of the word of life) *shall go away into everlasting punishment: but the righteous into life eternal.*

Controversies about the sentence.

584 The sentence itself hath (by the perverseness of man's will, or by the curiosity of some wits) been made the matter of many controversies, especially in latter times; of which we shall deliver our opinion, as it shall fall out, in the prosecution of the positive truth which we are bound to believe.

The positive truths which I would commend unto the reader's meditation are three:

Three positive verities or conclusions.

The first, that *life everlasting* shall be awarded, *secundum opera*, or that all men shall receive their final doom according to their works.

The second, which will necessarily follow upon this; that *good works are necessary to salvation* or to the inheritance of this kingdom here promised.

The third, that good works are necessary to our admission into this kingdom, *non tanquam causa*

regnandi, sed quia viæ ad regnum, not as meritorious causes, for which this kingdom is by right due to us, or to any, but as the necessary way or path by which all such as seek to enter into this kingdom must pass.

To begin with the first point; that the final reward or retribution shall be *secundum opera*, according to men's works.

2. About this position, controversy between us and the Romish church there needed to have been none; unless some in that church had been more desirous to open a gap to new contentions, than ready to bring the controversies already set on foot to a triable issue, by reducing them to some point of contradiction.

But some, of good note in that church for learning and moderation, have left this animadversion upon these words of St. Matthew, that this place alone doth sufficiently evince that the final award or retribution shall be made *secundum opera, non secundum fidem*, "according to works, not according to faith." That God should render to every man, either in this life or at the last day, according unto his works, yea, according to all his works, we never denied, for Solomon had long since said as much, in his prayer to God, 2 Chron. vi. 30; yea all works, even the most secret works, those of the heart not excepted, shall have their proper award, and every man shall reap according to that he hath sown; whether he hath sown unto the flesh or unto the spirit. But that this final retribution should be made, *secundum opera, non secundum fidem*, "according to works only, not according to faith," we cannot grant, without contradiction to the truth delivered by our Saviour and St. Paul. For faith and works, by both their doctrines, are so strictly linked together, that if the final retribution be made according to men's works, it must likewise be awarded according to

men's faith. And unless the advocates of the modern Romish church had been disposed to follow those hypocrites, against whom St. James disputes in his second chapter, (in their notions or apprehensions of faith,) more than St. James, yea more than St. Paul, nay more than our Saviour himself, they could not be ignorant of that contradiction which is implied in their assertion, that the final retribution is made according to *works*, not according to *faith*[c]. *Know ye therefore*, saith our apostle, Gal. iii. 7, *that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham;* so Abraham is called *the father of the faithful;* and none can be his sons or children but by propagation or participation of his faith. Our Saviour saith unto the Jews, John viii. 39, *If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham;* and if they had done the works, they should have had the reward of Abraham; yet, as the apostle saith, *they that be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.*

585 So then it is true that God rewarded Abraham according to his works, and yet withal according to his faith; yea, he was therefore rewarded with blessing according to his works, because his works were done in faith, or because he was faithful in his works.

But do these Romanists, which say that we shall be rewarded according to works, not according to faith, as evidently contradict their pretended patron St. James as they do St. Paul? They do, without question, if we look into his intent and scope in that very place from which they seek to magnify works above faith, as well in point of justification, as in respect of salvation or final retribution.

[c] See the fathers cited by this author in his fourth book, ch. 11, &c. about the inseparableness of faith and works. [vol. iii. p. 159, &c.]

3. *Was not Abraham our father* (saith St. James, chap. ii. 21.) *justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?* Yet the same apostle doth not deny, but rather suppose, that Abraham offered up Isaac by faith; for so he adds, ver. 23, that by this work *the scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.* If this scripture were fulfilled by this work, then Abraham's faith did work in this work, or rather did work this work; it was his working faith or belief which was imputed unto him for righteousness; and it was impossible that Abraham should be rewarded according to this work, and not be rewarded as well according to his faith, as according to his work. Indeed if Abraham had professed only in general, that he did believe God and his word, but had started back from this or the like service which God had enjoined him, he had not been justified.

But why not justified? Only because he had no works? Nay, rather because not having such works as God required at his hands, his faith had not been sound and perfect; and his faith being not sound and perfect, had not been imputed unto him for righteousness. Now the scripture plainly affirms, and St. James takes it as granted, that Abraham's belief, not his works, was imputed to him for righteousness.

Albeit St. James doth say that the belief was perfected by the work, yet all the perfection was the perfection of his faith; the use and end of his work or of his trial was to perfect or strengthen his faith; as we say exercise of body doth perfect or confirm health; but it will not therefore follow that exercise of body is better than health, seeing all the perfection that it hath is at the service of health. So far was this work of Abraham, by which St. James saith his

faith was perfected, from being a distinct perfection from the perfection of his faith, that St. Paul includes the very work in his faith, Heb. xi. 17: *By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac.* The reason why he ascribes this work unto his faith is given ver. 19:—*accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.* It was a great and difficult matter for Abraham to believe that he should *become the father of many nations*, Rom. iv. 18; *he considered not his own body, being now about an hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb*, ver. 19. But it was a greater work after he had received Isaac (upon the thread of whose life the blessing promised, Gen. xv. 5, *of being the father of many nations*, did wholly depend) to offer him up in sacrifice; this was more than to believe in hope against hope; the ready way (for ought that human wisdom, or any experience. till that time manifested unto the world, could inform him) to cut the very throat of all his hopes or future blessings. But how great soever this work were, the strength by which it was wrought was merely the strength of his faith; so the apostle saith, Rom. iv. 20, 21, 22: *He staggered not at the*
586 *promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness.* So that if any man do not the works of Abraham, it is because he hath not the faith of Abraham; impossible it were for any man that hath the same measure of faith which Abraham had, not to do the like works which Abraham did. What measure of works truly good any man doth, so much or so great a measure he hath of true faith; and so far as

any man is rewarded according to his works, he is likewise rewarded according to his faith.

We may extend that saying of our Saviour (though spoken then but to one man) unto all and every man; *According to their faith, so shall it be done unto them.* And our Saviour, in the parable next before this sentence, expressly avoucheth, that the final award or retribution shall be according to faith; *Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord,* Matt. xxv. 23. No man shall be rewarded for any works, unless they were the works of faith, or done in faith. To speak properly, it is the fidelity of our works, or our fidelity in working, which shall be rewarded. As for those hypocrites against whom St. James disputes, (and from whose notion or conceit of faith the Romish schoolmen, for the most part, take their description of faith,) they had altogether as little of Abraham's faith as they had of Abraham's works; for if they had been partakers of Abraham's faith, then, as our apostle infers, Gal. iii. 7, *they had been the sons of Abraham;* and if they had been the sons of Abraham, they would (by our Saviour's inference) *have done the works of Abraham.* Such faith as they made brags of could not justify them, because it was a dead and fruitless faith, devoid of works. Such works as the Romish church doth magnify in opposition to faith, can neither justify nor receive any reward, because they are no faithful works, but rather like seeming fruits without any root. They put their works upon their faith, as we do sweet flowers upon dead corpses; neither can give life or perfection to others. The best censure that Christian faith or charity will permit us to give of their doctrine concerning the nature of faith and

works, is this, that albeit they all profess to believe that which their church believes, yet the most of them do neither believe nor practise as the church, in these points, teacheth. Their ignorance in this particular is much better than their knowledge of most of the rest.

But to conclude the first position; Because some of our writers exclude all works from the work of justification, some Roman writers (I dare not say all) sought to be even with them by excluding faith from sharing with works in the final award or retribution. For besides this eagerness of extreme opposition or desire to be contrary unto us, it is not imaginable what could move any learned writer amongst them to affirm that this final retribution shall be according to works, and deny it according to faith.

Good works necessary to salvation.

4. About the second position there is no controversy betwixt us and the Romish church; we hold good works to be as necessary to salvation as they do; as necessary according to both branches of necessity. Necessary they are *necessitate præcepti*, and necessary likewise *necessitate medii;* necessary by precept or duty, for God hath commanded us to do them; he hath redeemed us, to the end that we should serve him in righteousness and holiness. But many things which
587 are in this sense necessary, in that their omission doth necessarily include a breach of God's commandment, and by consequent a sin, do not always induce or argue a forfeiture of our estate in grace, or utter exclusion from the kingdom of heaven; for this reason we say that good works are necessary, not only *necessitate præcepti*, by way of command, but *necessitate medii*, as the way and means so necessary to salvation, that without the practice of them no man can be admitted into the kingdom of heaven. Through

the omission of good works many do forfeit that interest which they truly had in the promises of everlasting life.

Omission of good works forfeits our interest in the promises.

In the promise itself, all that are partakers of the word and sacrament, all that acknowledge the word revealed to be the way unto everlasting life, have a true interest. Of the pledge or earnest of the blessing promised, that is, of justifying or sanctifying grace, none are partakers, but such as are fruitful in good works, according to the means or abilities which God hath bestowed upon them.

Whether it be possible for such as are once estated in grace to give over the practice of good works, that here we leave to such as desire to exercise their wits in the controversies about falling from grace (and the rather, because we have spoke a word of that point in the twenty-sixth chapter of this book). Let them determine of the categorical affirmative or negative as they please; this conditional is most certain: If it be possible for him that hath grace or faith (in what measure soever) inherent to give over the practice of good works, he shall thereby forfeit his present estate in God's promises, and defeat his hopes of inheriting the kingdom of God. *Whosoever,* saith our Saviour, *shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.* Matt. v. 19, 20, 21. Yet did these scribes and Pharisees many good works, and made conscience of many duties, which many precise ones in our days do not trouble their consciences withal. This

notwithstanding, these scribes and Pharisees did exclude themselves from the kingdom of heaven (as here established on earth) by leaving other good works (altogether, or for the most part) undone, which the law of God did no less require at their hands. Even the good works which they did were not well done by them, because they were not done in faith; they never came so near unto the kingdom of heaven as to acknowledge Christ for their Lord, much less to be partakers of those gifts and graces of the Spirit which after his ascension were bestowed on men.

Nor shall all they which were partakers of those gifts, and which did still acknowledge him for their Lord, enter into the kingdom which is here prepared for such as continue in well doing. So saith our Saviour; *Not every one that* saith *unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that* doeth &c.....*Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity*, Matt. vii. 21, 22, 23.

Damnation awarded for omissions.

5. But in this place we see the sentence is not awarded for positive works of iniquity, but for omission of the duties of charity; he saith not, *Depart from* 588 *me ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels*, because ye have oppressed the poor and stranger, or for that ye have robbed the fatherless, and made a prey of the widow. These indeed are works of iniquity, and deserve exclusion from the kingdom of heaven.

But is it a work of iniquity not to work at all? as, not to give meat unto the hungry? not to give drink unto the thirsty? not to clothe the naked, or lodge the

harbourless? Yes; even these omissions deserve exclusion from the kingdom of heaven, either by their connexion with sins of oppression, because it is scarce possible that any which hear Christ's promises should be barren of good works, unless they were too fruitful in the works of impiety and oppression; or rather because, as our Saviour elsewhere infers, that not to save men's lives when means and opportunities are offered, is to kill; not to feed the hungry, is a bloody sin; not to clothe the naked, is as the sin of oppression.

The doing of some good works cannot excuse men for the omission of others which be as necessary: to prophesy in Christ's name is a gracious work; to cast out devils is a work of greater charity and comfort to the possessed, than to visit the prisoners; and yet such as have done these, and many other wonderful works, shall not be admitted at the last day.

Besides the goodness of the works which we are bound to do, there must be an uniformity in them, otherwise they are not done in faith. Now the same faith and belief which inclines our hearts to works of one kind, will incline them to the practice of every kind which we know or believe to be required at our hands by our Lord and Master. That even the best works of mercy, or most beneficial unto others, are not acceptable unto God, unless they be done out of faith and obedience to our Master's will, is clear from our apostle's verdict of Enoch, Heb. xi. 5: *Before his translation,* saith our apostle, *he had this testimony, that he pleased God;* for so it is said, Gen. v. 24, *that he walked with God;* the way by which he walked was his good works and conversation, but the guide of this way, and his works, was his faith. So the apostle infers, *without faith it is impossible to please*

God: for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Heb. xi. 6. As God is the author of goodness, yea goodness itself, so we cannot come unto him by any other way than by doing good to others; yet that which must make even our best works pleasing to him, must be our belief in him and in his goodness, and that he is a bountiful rewarder of all that do good.

The good works even of the heathen, and of such as knew neither him nor his providence—of such as instead of him worshipped false gods—were rewarded by him, but with rewards and blessings only temporal: he was their rewarder, but not himself their reward. This was the peculiar of Abraham his friend, and of Abraham's children, that is, of all such as do the works of Abraham out of the faith of Abraham, that is, out of a lively apprehension and true esteem of his goodness; unto all such he himself shall be *merces magna nimis*, or *valde magna—their exceeding great reward.* Unto men thus qualified, and only unto them, it shall be said, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.* This kingdom shall be a kingdom of everlasting bliss; and yet the greatest blessedness of this kingdom shall consist in the fruition or enjoying of the presence of this everlasting King, who is goodness itself; the participation
589 of whose goodness is the very life and essence of that happiness which all desire, but none shall attain, besides such as do his will by well doing. To be separated for ever from his presence is the source of all the misery which shall befall the damned or accursed.

But from this place of our apostle, Heb. xi. 6, the

Romanist (always ready, like the spider, to suck poison from such flowers in this garden of God as naturally afford honey to such as seek God) labours to infer, as he doth out of the words of the text, that the everlasting kingdom here promised is the just reward of our good works, and is as properly merited as everlasting death is by the omission of the works here mentioned, or by the positive works of iniquity. So that I should here, according to my proposed method, proceed unto the third point, that these good works, how necessary soever they be, are necessary only *tanquam via ad regnum, non tanquam causa regnandi*, "only as the way and means which lead unto this kingdom, not as the causes of its preparations for us, or for our admission unto it." But for the present I choose rather to make some use or application of what hath been said concerning the necessity of good works, than to dispute of their efficacy or causality for attaining this kingdom, intending to touch that a little more in the next chapter, though with reference to what I have spoken in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth chapters.

The Romanist's wresting Heb. xi. 6. to maintain merit of works.

The third positive truth, mentioned §. 1, handled chap. 31. [below, p. 592.]

6. You see that good works done in faith (or, which is all one, a working faith) are absolutely necessary unto salvation. But are they as necessary to justification? If they be, how is it said by St. Austin, and approved by the articles of the church of England, *Bona opera sequuntur hominem justificatum, non præcedunt in homine justificando*—"Good works follow justification; they do not go before it? This orthodoxal truth only imports thus much, that no man can do those works which are capable of the promises before he be enabled by God to do them; and that this ability to do them is from the gift of justifying faith. Now every one that hath this faith in his heart

is said to be justified, that is, absolved from the guilt of sins past, and freed from the tyranny and dominion of sin, by receiving this pledge or earnest of God's mercy; and in this sense is justification taken by St. James, when he saith, *a man is justified by works*, that is, he is not to be accounted the son of faithful Abraham, nor may he presume upon his own actual justification or estate in grace, until he be qualified and enabled to do the works of Abraham. In the same sense is justification taken by St. John, Rev. xxii. 11: *Qui justus est justificetur adhuc—Let him that is righteous, be righteous still, or more justified.* And in this sort children or infants are said to be justified by the infusion of faith. The practice of good works is not required to their justification before they come to the knowledge of good and evil. But neither is the apprehension or actual belief of God's mercies in Christ required of them, though they be justified and saved for the merits of Christ, and through his blood, as we are. Yet is not the rule for application of these merits the same in them and in men of years and discretion, (though, with some abatement or allowance, it holds in such as are converted to Christ upon their death-beds;) these must apprehend God's mercies in Christ, resolve to do good works, and leave testimony of sorrow for their past negligence in doing good works; for in such as are endued with knowledge of Christ, and are enlightened to see their miserable estate by nature, the selfsame faith which apprehends God's mercies in Christ, cannot be idle, it will be working
590 that which is good and acceptable in the sight of God. In vain it shall be for them to sue for mercy at God's hands through the merits of Christ, unless for love to Christ (whose merits for them and goodness towards them faith apprehends) they be ready to do the works

which he hath commended unto them. For (as you heard before) *not every one that saith unto him, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of his Father which is in heaven;* and his Father's will is, that we do those things which he here commands.

But another special branch of the same will is, that when we have done all this, we faithfully acknowledge ourselves to be *unprofitable servants.* This our plea for mercy (as men altogether unworthy for our best works' sake to be partaker of God's goodness or of everlasting bliss) is that justification which St. Paul so much insists upon in most of his epistles; and unto this justification, that is, to our good success in making this plea, good works are necessary, and usually precedent; or, as it is usually taught by good writers, good works are necessary *quoad presentiam*, (to justification,) *non quoad efficientiam;* "their presence is necessary to justification, their efficacy or efficiency is not necessary;" for as you have heard before, and shall afterwards (chap. xxxi.) hear, meritorious efficiency they have none.

7. But let us ever remember, as I often put the reader in mind, when it is said, we must renounce all our works in the plea of justification or suit of pardon for our sins, this must be understood of those good works which we have done, not of those which we have left undone; for these are not ours; these the hypocrites and unbelievers will be ready to renounce. He alone truly renounceth his works, that doth good works, and yet, when he hath done them, puts no trust or confidence in them, and seeks not to improve them so far as to make them meritorious, but wholly relies upon God's mercies in Christ, appealing from the law unto the gospel. Nor is it every sort of reliance upon

God's mercies in Christ, but a faithful and steadfast reliance, that can avail; and no man can faithfully rely upon Christ's merits, but he that is faithful in doing his Father's will.

8. But is this necessity of good works to be equally extended to all sorts of good works? So saith St. James, chap. ii. 10, 11: *Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.* His meaning is, that albeit we are diligent in many points of God's service, yet if we wittingly dispense with our souls in other parts of it, this is an argument that we truly and faithfully observe no part; for if we did observe any part of his commandments, out of faith or sincere obedience to God's will, we would observe, as much as in us lies, every branch of his will revealed[d].

For as true faith will not admit προσωποληψίας, respect of persons, (which was the fault in the beginning of that chapter taxed by St. James, and gave occasion to the maxim or principle in the words last cited,) so doth it exclude all πρόσκλισιν partiality to God's commandments or branches of his will revealed; if we love and prize one, we must love and value all; we may not love and respect one and neglect another. This is the true intent and meaning of the apostle, which some (to the wounding of their brethren's weak consciences) have extended too far, who say expressly,
591 (or at least are so defective in expressing themselves, as they occasion others to think,) that if a man either positively or more grievously transgress in breach of God's negative precepts, or often fail in performance

[d] See this author's treatise of justifying faith, or fourth book, chap. 5. [vol. iii. p. 267.]

of some positive duties commanded by him, it is all one as if he had transgressed all God's commandments.

This is more than can be gathered from St. James in this place, or from any other part of God's word, which only condemns partiality to God's commandments. Now a man may trespass oftener and more grievously against some one or more of God's commandments (whether negative or affirmative) than he doth against others, and yet do all this, not out of any passionate affected partiality towards God's commandments, or for want of uniformity in his faith or affections towards Christ, but only out of the inequality of his own natural or acquired inclinations to some peculiar sins or vices in respect of others. Some men, as well before regeneration, or knowledge of Christ, as after, may be naturally, or out of custom, more prone to wantonness than unto covetousness. Others again, by natural disposition or bad custom may be more prone to covetousness, to ambition, or unadvised anger, than unto wantonness. Others again, by bad education, may be more prone to rash oaths or causeless swearing than to any the former vices. One sort, after their regeneration, or after they come to make conscience of their ways, may offend more often and more grievously against the third commandment than against the sixth or seventh. Another sort may offend more grievously against the sixth commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*, than against the seventh, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*. A third sort, such as are by natural disposition or custom given to wantonness, may offend more grievously against the seventh commandment than against the sixth. A fourth sort, more peculiarly prone to covetousness or ambition, may offend more grievously and more often against the last

A sinister exposition of St. James ii. 10.

commandment, *Thou shalt not covet*, than against any of the former. And yet none of them fall under that censure of St. James, *Whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all:* for they may all respectively offend in some one part, or few points, not out of any partiality to God's law or commandments, but out of the inequality of their particular or peculiar dispositions to observe them.

Their desires or endeavours to observe those duties which they more neglect, may perhaps be greater than their desires or endeavours to observe those wherein they are less defective. However this may fall out, yet this rule is certain: That whosoever truly observes any or more of God's commandments out of faith and sincere obedience to his will; as his love and zealous observance of those commandments, in whose practice he finds less difficulty, increaseth, his proneness to transgress the other, from whose observance he is by nature or custom more averse, will still decrease; his positive diligence or care to practise those duties which are not so contrary to his natural inclinations, will always, in some proportion or other, raise or quicken his weak desires or inclinations to observe those duties which he hath formerly more often and more grievously neglected or opposed.

Why Christ instances in works of charity rather than of piety.

9. But some haply will here demand why our Saviour in this place of St. Matthew, chap. xxv. 34, &c., (seeing all good works are necessary unto salvation,) should instance only in works of one kind, that is, in works of charity towards others, and not in works of piety and sanctity, as in fasting and praying. It is an 592 excellent observation, (and so much the more to be esteemed by us in that it was,) made by Jansenius, a learned bishop, not of the reformed, but of the Romish church, that however fasting, and other exercises of

mortification, be duties necessary in their time and place, yet God is better pleased with us for relieving and comforting others in their affliction, (be it affliction of body or of soul,) than for afflicting our own souls and bodies; and as for fasting, one good use of it is, to learn by our voluntary want of food truly to pity and comfort others which want it against their wills; we then truly fast, or our fast is then truly religious, when we fast, not for thrift or sparing, or for the health of body, but that what we spare from ourselves we may bestow (not sparingly, but cheerfully) upon our needy brethren. So the prophet instructs us, Isaiah lviii. 5, 6, 7: *Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul? is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? wilt thou call this a fast, an acceptable day to the Lord? is not this the fast that I have chosen? to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?* Again; fasting is useful or expedient only at some certain times and seasons; these duties here mentioned, Matt. xxv. 34, &c., are at all times necessary; they are never out of season; they are (upon the respects last mentioned) most seasonable when we fast, and yet in some sort more seasonable when we feast. For feasting of ourselves or of the rich, being unmindful of the poor and needy, is to bring a curse upon ourselves and upon our plenty, as we see it set forth in the parable of Lazarus and Dives. (See Prov. xxii. 16. Luke xiv. 13.)

St. Austin observes, that the duty of praying continually is not literally meant of praying always with our lips, nor of multiplying set hours of devotion; but *omne opus bonum*, "every good work is a real prayer," specially if we consecrate ourselves to it by prayer. The continuance of good works begun and undertaken by prayer is a continuation of our prayers; so that by praying often, and doing good to others continually, we may be said to observe or fulfil that precept, *Pray continually.*

10. As we cannot more truly imitate or express our Saviour's disposition in more solid characters than by the practice of these duties, (for *he went about doing good, healing all that were oppressed,*) so are there no duties which are so easy for all to imitate him in as these are; none can plead exemption for want of means or opportunity to practise them; for though some be so needy themselves, that they cannot clothe the naked, or feed the hungry, yet may they visit the sick, or resort to such as are in prison. As every one in some kind or other may be the object of his neighbour's charity, so may every one be either instrument or agent in the doing thereof. The rich may stand in need of visitation, or of their neighbours' prayers, either for continuance or restoration of health; and they cannot want other on whom to exercise their charity; for, as our Saviour saith, *Pauperes semper habebitis vobiscum—You shall always have the poor amongst you;* and who knows, whether the Lord in mercy hath not suffered the poor in these places to abound, that the rich, or men of competent means, might have continual and daily occasion to practise these duties here continually enjoined. We of this
593 place[e] cannot want soil to sow unto the Lord; for, as

[e] About Newcastle-upon-Tyne, where these were preached.

the former parable imports, we shall not want occasion to put out the talent wherewith God hath blessed us to advantage: so Solomon saith: *He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him again.* Prov. xix. 17. What greater encouragement can any man either give or require to the performance of this service than that which our Lord and Master hath given to all which either truly love him, or esteem of his love? What can the eloquence of man add to this invitation in this place? What better assurance could any man require than the solemn promise of so powerful and gracious a Lord? Or what greater reward or blessing could any man expect to have assured unto him than that which our Saviour here assures us—Whatsoever we do to the poor and distressed, he will interpret it as done to himself, and really so reward it?

And with reference to this last day of final retribution did the psalmist say, psalm xli. 1, *Blessed is he that considereth the poor: the Lord will deliver him in time of trouble.* Sickness, death, and judgment, are critical days of trouble.

The worse the poor be, the more we may be charitable unto them.

But I know it will be objected, that the greatest part of the poor which dwell and sojourn amongst us are not such little ones as our Saviour here speaks of, that is, not his brethren; men or children they be, which for the most part draw near unto him with their lips when they hope to receive an alms through his name, but are far from him in their hearts; more ready at most times, and upon no occasion, to abuse his name with fearful oaths, than to call upon it in prayer, in reverence, and humility. Would God the matter objected were not too true! However, the truth of it doth not so much excuse the contraction,

as it doth exact the extension of your bowels of compassion towards them.

11. Seeing for them also Christ shed his blood, their ignorance of Christ and his goodness should move us all to a deeper touch of pity and compassion towards them than sight of their bodily distress, of their want or calamity, can affect us with; and this deep touch of pity or compassion would raise our spirits to an higher point of service unto Christ, than any relief or supply of their bodily wants can amount unto. You may (if you will for Christ's sake be pleased to do it) distribute so unto their bodily necessities, as you may lay a necessity upon their souls of coming to the ordinary knowledge of Christ, and of God's mercies in him towards man. You may by authority put the precept of our apostle in execution, *Such as will not work, let them not eat;* or such as will not work the ordinary works of God, that will not labour to be instructed in his fear and in his laws, let them not be partakers of your bounty and pity.

All neglect of the poor is sin; this spiritual neglect is a sin exceeding sinful.

To constrain the poor, the halt, and lame, to enter into the Lord's house were a matter easy, if, as the law of God and man requires, none were permitted to remain amongst us but such as were confined to some certain dwelling or abode, where they might live under the inspection or cure as well of civil as of ecclesiastic discipline. And consider with yourselves, I beseech you, how either the civil or ecclesiastic magistrate will be able to answer the great King at the last day, through whose default (whether jointly or severally) many children have been by baptism received into Christ's church, and yet permitted after to live such a roving and wandering life, that no tie can be laid upon them to give an account of their

faith or Christian conversation to any church or ambassador of Christ. But as bodies, while they are in 594
motion, are in no place, though they pass through many; so these wandering meteors are of no church, though they be in every church. If I should in private persuade you magistrates to seek some redress of this enormity, and blemish to the government of this place, I doubt I should be put off with the exception, to which I could not easily reply, 'that you have better experience than I or others of my opinion or profession have, and out of that experience see greater difficulties than we can discern.'

But now having express warrant from our Saviour's words, and this fair opportunity of time and place, you must give me leave to reply unto you, as an ingenious and learned scholar once did to a Christian emperor, which pretended greater difficulties in a good work, which he commended to his princely care, than you can do in this; yet a work not altogether so necessary, nor so acceptable unto God, as this work would be: *In rebus piis aggrediendis nefas est considerare quantum tu potes, sed quantum Deo fidis qui omnia potest;* "Think not, when you are about works of piety, so much of your own ability (or weakness), but examine how much you rely and trust in Almighty God, who is able to do exceeding abundantly above what we conceive or think."

CHAP. XXXI.

MATT. XXV. 34, 35, 41, 42.

Come, ye blessed of my Father ..... : FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat : I was thirsty ..... Depart from me, ye cursed : ..... FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat : I was thirsty .....

Jansenius's observation and disputation, about merit, examined, and convinced of contradiction to itself and to the truth. The definition of merit. The state of the question concerning merit. Increase of grace no more meritable than the first grace. A promise made ex mero motu, sine ratione dati et accepti, *cannot found a title to merits. Such are all God's promises, issues of mere grace, mercy, and bounty. The Romanists of kin to the Pharisee : yet indeed more to be blamed than he. The objection from the causal particle FOR made and answered.*

Jansenius's observation.

1. AGAINST such as deny the merit of human works, "Thus much," saith Jansenius, (an ingenuous and learned bishop, though a papist,) "is diligently to be observed, that Christ in this place deputes this kingdom to the righteous, FOR their work's sake; hereby giving us to understand, that life eternal is bestowed upon them FOR their works, by which the righteous merit life eternal, even as the wicked by their evil works merit everlasting punishment."

The only ground or reason of this assertion is, for that our Saviour's form of speech in both sentences is the same, and causal in both : as he saith unto the wicked, *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, ... FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat,* &c., vv. 41, 42 : so he saith unto the righteous, or them on his right hand, vv. 34, 35, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you ..... FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat,* &c.

Yet, lest any man should except against him, as 595
dissenting from the doctrine of Christ elsewhere delivered, and from the apostolic and catholic church, by which our salvation is ascribed to God's grace and mercy, he adds this salve to the wound which he had made: *Non tamen sic meritis nostris putetur dari vita æterna*, &c.: "Let no man think that life eternal is so bestowed upon our merits, as all may not be given to the mercy of God, from which we have our good works or merits." He grants withal, that the salvation of the righteous depends upon God's blessing and predestination, upon which likewise their good works depend, lest any should glory in himself; a sin forbidden by God's prophet, Jer. ix. 23.

A catholic verity.

That all then is to be attributed to God's mercy—that no man may glory in himself, or in his works—is true, our enemies in this point being judges; is confessed by our adversaries, even in this place from which they seek to establish merits. And this we may conclude is a point of catholic doctrine taught by Christ, prophets, and apostles, steadfastly embraced by all reformed churches, and expressly (in words) acknowledged by the Romish church. With this point of catholic faith we mingle no doctrine, no opinion, which may but questionably pollute or defile it; we avoid all occasions of incurring the least suspicion of contradicting it; and for this cause we abandon the very name of *merit*, as now it is used (or rather abused) by the Romish church: although in some ages of the church it were an indifferent and harmless term, *mereri* importing no more (as was shewed above, p. 513, &c.) than *to get* or *obtain*.

The definition of merit.

But *merit*, in the language of the modern Romish church, *est actio, cui justum est ut aliquid detur*, "is an action or work to which (something or) any thing

is due by rule of justice." Yet doth the Romish church not only enjoin the use or familiarity of this name in this sense or signification, but require the assent of faith unto the reality expressed by it.

2. The points then which lie upon that church to prove, (if she will acquit herself from polluting the holy catholic faith,) are two:

The one, That this doctrine of meriting heaven by works doth not contradict the former part of catholic doctrine acknowledged by her, to wit, that all is to be ascribed to the mercy of God; that no man ought to glory in himself, or in his works.

The other, That this doctrine of merit is taught by the Holy Ghost, as either by Christ himself, by his prophets, or apostles; for so it must be taught, if it be imposed as an article of faith, although we could not convince it to contradict the former, or any other article of faith.

First then of the state of the question, or point of difference betwixt us.

Secondly, of the refutation of their opinions.

Thirdly, the answer to the objection which they frame out of the causal particles in this text, Matt. xxv. 34, 41.

The state of the question.

3. That the doctrine of merits doth not contradict the catholic doctrine, which ascribes our salvation wholly to the mercy of God, Jansenius seeks to justify by this one reason: for that the Romish church doth acknowledge those good works (wherein she placeth merits) to proceed from the mercy of God. But this speech of his, *Habemus bona opera a misericordia Dei*, "By or from the mercies of God we have our good works," is indefinite; that is, it is uncertain how far this man himself, or any of his profession, do acknowledge good works to proceed from

the mercy of God. If he had said, that all our good 596
works are wholly from God, this had agreed well with both branches of his former conclusion; as first, 'That all were to be given to the mercy of God;' and secondly, 'That no man might glory in himself or in his works.' But if his speech had been thus far extended, it would have left no room for merits; whereas the doctrine of merits must have place in all the writings that come from the Roman press, albeit perhaps the writer himself had assigned them none. But if either all our good works be not from God, or if all of them be from God *quoad originem*, only as they are in the root, but not as they are in their growth and perfection, then there may perhaps some place be left for merit. So much of them as proceeds from ourselves, and not from God, might be accounted our own; but yet, being ours, there is no necessity that God should reward them with everlasting life.

Consider three things.

For the clearer understanding of our adversaries' meaning, and the state of the question betwixt us and them, we may consider, first, the root or faculty; secondly, the stem or habit of meritorious works; thirdly, the fruit or works themselves, or the exercise or practice of or according to their habit. The root or faculty whence works truly good do spring (as most of the Romish church now acknowledge) is grace infused. And this infusion of grace (by which men in their divinity are first justified) they acknowledge to be wholly from God. And in that they acknowledge the first grace, or root of good works, to be wholly from God's mercy, they consequently deny that it can be merited. It is a maxim in their modern schools, as we shewed before, that *fundamentum meriti non cadit sub merito:* "the foundation of merits cannot be merited." And this foundation of

merits is the first grace by which man is first justified: but after this grace be once infused, the use of it depends upon man's freewill: he that useth this talent well, or not amiss, shall have more given him. This overplus the Romish church ascribes to the merit of works; and by the habitual and constant use of grace and freewill, life eternal itself (by their doctrine) may be properly merited. We acknowledge that whosoever doth not hide the talent of grace, but employs it aright, shall certainly receive increase of grace from God, and be partaker of joy according to the measure of his works, though not for his works' sake, or for his right use of grace.

Increase of grace no more merited than the first grace.

4. We say the increase of grace is no more from any works, or merits of works, than the first grace itself is. The inheritance of eternal life can no more be purchased by the fullest measure of grace, or greatest perfection of works, (that in this life can be attained unto,) than the first grace can be purchased by works. That the first grace is not given for our works, is not procured by them, the Romish church now acknowledgeth.

This beginning of grace or foundation of merits they confess that they receive from the sole blessing or predestination of God. And so say we, all increase of grace—the preparation of this kingdom for us—our preparation to be capable of it—our admission into it, are the effects likewise of God's predestination, and the fruits of his mercy; yet not so as that his mercy or predestination doth impose any necessity upon the men for whom this kingdom is prepared: we deny not a freedom of will in this preparation, but the merit of our freewill[a]. A freedom of will we have

[a] About freewill, see an elaborate treatise, book 10. chap. 24, &c. [vol. ix. p. 160.]

to neglect or despise the ordinary means by which grace is bestowed; a freedom likewise to hide or not employ those talents or blessings which God hath already bestowed upon us. If we do evil, or employ these talents amiss, the evil is wholly our own, the 597
miscarriage is wholly our own: if we do well, or employ them aright, this is God's work, and not ours; or not so ours, as that we may hence challenge any reward as due unto us. No man can do well, unless he be enabled first by God to do well; and the more he is enabled by God's gifts and graces bestowed upon him, the more he is bound to God. Nor can we ever in this life be so thankful unto God for gifts already received as we ought to be. The least increase of grace, after the first grace given, exceeds the greatest measure of our service or thankfulness, if we could impartially esteem or rate them by their proper worth or weight. So that the more grace we receive from God, or the better our works are, the more still we are indebted to him that enables us to work: and as our debt to him increaseth, so our title to merit any thing at his hands (questionless) decreaseth.

To conclude then;

That which creates a new title of bond or debt unto God from us cannot possibly be the ground-title of merits (that is, of any debts or dues from God to us): A syllogism.

But grace (not the first grace only, but all increase of grace) doth still create or found a new title of debt from us to God:

Therefore, neither the first grace nor any increase of grace can be *fundamentum meriti*, any foundation or ground-title unto merits.

But rather, seeing merits include a debt or due from God to us, he that most aboundeth in grace,

which is the free gift of God, will be most ready to disclaim all merits.

If there be not *ratio dati et accepti*, a promise is no ground of merit.

6. But if works (it may be some of the Romish church will say) cannot deserve everlasting life in themselves, or as they are wrought by us, yet may they deserve it, inasmuch as God hath promised life eternal to all that continue in well doing. But that good works should deserve eternal life, only upon supposal of God's promise, some of the greatest scholars (I will not say of the best men amongst them) will not yield. But to take them at their best, as when they say, that 'Good works do merit as much as God hath promised to reward them with;' this is too bad. For *to merit*, in their language, is a great deal more than *to be rewarded;* it includes a reward due unto the works wrought, not merely given out of the mercy or bounty of him that promiseth.

The rule is general, 'Whatsoever any man hath interest in by promise, it must be expected, sued for, and accepted upon the same terms that it is promised;' unless, between the promise made and the performance of it, we can oblige the party promising, by some real service that may be profitable unto him, more than was included in the conditions to which the promise did tie us: to do more than is covenanted and promised, so it be behooveful for either party, especially if it be profitable to the rewarding party, deserves a reward in equity, though not in law, at his hands to whom it is behooveful. If the party which promiseth us a good turn receive any thing from us in lieu or consideration of what he promiseth, he is tied in law to perform his promise, and is a debtor till he perform it: the performance is not a mere courtesy or bounty, but an act of commutative justice. The assuming of a shilling may bind a man to the payment

of many pounds. Wheresoever there is *quid pro quo*, or *ratio dati et accepti*, something as well given as taken upon mutual promise, there is an act of commutative justice; and wheresoever there is not *ratio dati et accepti*, somewhat given as well as taken, there can be nothing due in justice. From this ground some great schoolmen in the Romish church 598
deny justice commutative, or that branch of justice which is the rule of all matters of bargain or sale, to be properly in God, because there cannot be *ratio dati et accepti*, any mutual giving or taking between God and his creatures; for he gives us all that we have or can have, we cannot possibly give him any thing which he hath not. And for this reason, albeit he were purposed to bestow the greatest measure of grace upon us that any creature is capable of, this could not include any grace of merit; for still the more place grace hath in our hearts, the less room there is for merit.

True it is, that our Lord and Saviour did merit heaven at his Father's hands for us; but the ground and foundation of this his merit was not only the fullness of grace in him as man, but that he being in the form of God, the Son of God, equal to his Father, did humble himself and become man for us, and did his Father's service as man; he therefore did merit all graces for us, because he was the Son of God, not by adoption or creation, but by eternal generation. To be the sons of God by adoption, or to be made his sons by grace, is a blessing bestowed on us, for the which we become debtors to God the Father, and servants to God the Son; so deeply indebted to both, that albeit we should do ten times more than we do, we should still be unprofitable servants; we could not make the least recompense for that which he hath done for us.

The manner of the apostle's interrogation, Rom. xi. 35, *Quis prior illi dedit?—Who hath first given to him?* includes an universal negation, No man hath given aught to God; no man can give any thing unto him. And if none can give any thing unto him, none can receive any thing from him by way of merit or valuable consideration, but of mere mercy and free bounty.

7. If we would scan the tenor of all God's promises made unto us in scripture with such accurateness as lawyers do tenures of land, we should find that he only promiseth to be merciful and bountiful unto us; whether we limit his promises to the first grace which we receive from him, or extend them to all after increase of grace, or to the accomplishing of all blessings promised in this life by our admission unto life eternal in the world to come. Now if mercy and bounty be the complete object of all his promises, then may we not expect performance or accomplishment of his promises, as a just recompense or merit for any service which we do him, but only as the fruit or effect of his mercy or loving-kindness.

If a loving earthly father should allot his son a liberal pension before he could in modesty ask it, or in discretion expect it, and promise him withal, that if he did employ this present year's pension well, he would allow him more liberally for the next year following; in this case, how well soever his son did either demean himself, or use his present pension, yet, seeing the whole profit did redound unto himself, not unto his father, the more bountifully his father deals with him in the years following, the more still he is bound unto him. An ingenuous or gracious son would not challenge the second or third year's pension as more due unto him by right or merit than the first, albeit he had his father's promise for these two years,

which he had not for the first: for the father's promise was only to be good and bountiful unto him, so he would be dutifully thankful for his bounty. Now to expect or challenge that by way of right and merit, which is promised merely out of favour or loving-kindness, and upon condition of dutiful demeanour, 599
is a transgression of duty, an high degree of unthankfulness, especially from a son unto the father: for every son, by the law of God and nature, owes obedience and respect unto his father; and though there be no mutual bond of obedience, yet is there a bond of mutual duty between an earthly father and his son; at least the father as well as the son owes obedience unto God's law, and God's law enjoins every father unto kind usage of his son, so he challenge it not by way of debt or merit, but in love, humility, or obedience.

But on our heavenly Father no bond of obedience, of debt, or duty can be laid; what good soever he doth unto us, it is merely from his free mercy and loving-kindness. It was his mere goodness to create us, to give our first parents such being as once they had. This first being could not be merited, nor doth any Romanist affirm it could. Having lost that goodness wherein we were created, it was more than mere goodness, the abundance of mercy, to make us any promise of restauration to our first blood and dignity. And after this promise made, it is but the continuation or increase of the same abundant mercy to bestow the grace of adoption upon us; and no more it is than a continuance or overplus of this abundant mercy, to increase this grace of adoption in us yearly, daily, and hourly. Lastly, to crown this continuance of his grace and mercy towards us with an everlasting kingdom, is but an abundant excess of the same mercy and

loving-kindness, out of which he first promised the grace of adoption, and daily increased it: *Si merita nostra aliquid facerent, ad damnationem nostram veniret. Non venit ille ad inspectionem meritorum, sed ad remissionem peccatorum. Non fuisti, et factus es: quid Deo dedisti? malus fuisti, et liberatus es: quid Deo dedisti? quid non ab eo gratis accepisti? merito et gratia nominatur, quia gratis datur.*

Briefly, in that God's mercy and goodness is absolutely infinite, it can admit of no external motive or inducement either for bestowing the first grace upon us, or for increasing it, or for the perpetuation of it: we may deserve or merit the withdrawing of his mercies from us, or the decrease of his blessings, but deserve or merit their increase we cannot; for merit supposeth more than a motive or inducement; it necessarily includeth a tie or obligement; whereas no obligement or inducement can be laid upon infinite goodness, whose continuation and increase is likewise successively infinite (without all period or restraint) unto all such as do not merit or provoke the substraction or diminution of it.

How the papists and Pharisee agree in this point: rather how they exceed him.

8. Difference in this point of merit between the doctrine of the modern Romish church, and the doctrine, or rather the conceit, of the Pharisee, I for my part could never conceive any, save only *secundum magis et minus*, a difference of defect and excess. The nature and quality of their opinions and conceits is the same. The excess of pride or self-conceit of their own works, and of their worth, is on the Romanists' part, not on the Pharisees'. The Pharisees were men of more strict life than most either of the Romish or reformed churches now living be. They abstained from many enormities in which the publicans with

whom they lived did wallow; they were zealous followers of many good works, which the publicans did not so much as approve, much less practise, least of all practise with zeal and constancy. But were they therefore nearer to the kingdom of heaven here promised? or were they more justified by their works than the publicans were which did not work? The parable of the Pharisee and the publican, Luke xviii, doth witness the contrary: *I tell you*, saith our Saviour, 600
ver. 14, *this man went down to his house justified rather than the other*, to wit, the Pharisee. What was it then that made the Pharisee more uncapable of justification than the publican? want of works? No; as he allegeth, (and no man could disprove his allegation,) he fasted twice in the week, and gave tithe of all that ever he possessed. What then? only the opinion of merits, or overweening conceit of the worth of these his positive works, or of his abstinence from gross and mortal sins.

But it may be he ascribed all this to his own freewill, not to the favour and grace of God. Not so; for if we compare him with the modern papists in this point, we are bound in conscience to pronounce the same sentence of them that our Saviour did of the Pharisee and the publican. The Pharisee, that very Pharisee which our Saviour said was less justified than the publican, is more justifiable than any modern Romanist which believes the doctrine of merits as now it is taught, or despiseth our church as less holy than the church of Rome for denying the merit of works. For even this Pharisee, albeit he thought himself a great deal better than the publican, yet did he not ascribe this to himself, or to his freewill; for so he makes his confession, ver. 11, *God, I thank thee, that*

I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. In saying thus, he did acknowledge not only his positive good works, (as fasting and paying tithes,) but his abstinence from evil, as from extortion &c., to be from God: for he thanks him that he was not an extortioner; and his solemn thanks include an acknowledgment that it was his gift whom he thanks, that he was no extortioner, no unjust or adulterous person. That the Pharisee did conceive as the Romanist doth, that the first grace, by which he began to be more observant of God's laws than the publicans or other men were, was only from God; and that the increase of this grace, or his proficiency in good life and works, was from himself, or the effect of his free-will, this is more than can be laid unto his charge; for he saith not, 'God, I thank thee, that thou hast converted or reclaimed me from so sinful paths as this publican walks in:' to have said thus much and no more, might have left a suspicion that he did acknowledge the first grace of his conversion to be God's mere gift, not so the second or third grace; or the increase of grace, or his proficiency in good life. But now he saith, *God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, or even as this publican:* this includeth an acknowledgment, that all the perfection whereof until this very day he deemed himself possessed, was from God, was his free gift. So that it would be very hard to fasten any part of the doctrine of merits, which is now stiffly maintained by the Romish church, upon this Pharisee.

Seeing then he boasts of nothing which he doth not acknowledge that he had received from God, wherein doth his Pharisaical pride or conceit, or (as the evangelist styles it) his trust in himself, consist? Only in that he

glories in God's graces as if he had not received them; in that he was not humbled by that grace, which by his own acknowledgment he had received from God; therefore is he less justified than the publican. So then the true end and use of all our works, of all the graces which God bestows upon us in this life, is to teach us true humility, and *to work out our salvation with fear and trembling;* as men that seek for the kingdom of heaven, not by works, much less as due to our works, but by acknowledgment of God's mere mercy, and our own unworthiness.

Many which in words disclaim the doctrine of me- 601
rits (as, for aught I know, this Pharisee did) may secretly trust in themselves or in their merits; but none which make the doctrine of merits a point of belief, as the Romanists do, but must of necessity trust in themselves and in their merits, as this Pharisee did: hence, saith St. Augustine, *Vis excidere a gratia? jactes merita:* "Wouldest thou fall from grace? boast of thy merits."

9. All that they have to object against us from this place is from the form of our Saviour's speech, *Inherit the kingdom of God prepared for you:* FOR *I was an hungred, &c.*

The objection drawn from the causal particle *for*, in the text, framed and answered.

The form of it is causal; and it necessarily imports some cause; as, either the cause of the preparation of the kingdom, or of the righteous their admission into it. Otherwise, the same form of speech, ver. 42, *For I was an hungred, and ye gave me no meat,* should not import the true cause why the wicked are sentenced to hell. But the protestants (say they) generally grant that this particle γάρ, *for*, ver. 41, doth import that the true cause why the wicked are condemned to hell is the omission of these works: and hence they infer that the true cause why the righteous are ad-

mitted into heaven is the performance of those works which the wicked neglected; and that our Saviour did note out this cause unto us in the manner of his speech; *Inherit the kingdom prepared for you: FOR I was an hungred, and ye gave me meat; I was naked, and ye clothed me.* Hence, saith Jansenius, "the righteous do merit eternal life by their good works, as the wicked do everlasting punishment by their bad works." This is his note upon the words: and the only ground or reason of this inference is because the form of our Saviour's speech is one and the same in both sentences, as well in the sentence of life as in the sentence of death.

Jansenius his argument.

The author his answer.

But though the phrase or manner of speech be the same, will Jansenius therefore stand to the inference or observation which he makes upon them; viz. That the good works of the righteous are altogether as true causes of inheriting the kingdom of heaven, as the bad works of the wicked, or their omission of good works, are of their damnation to hell?

That this was his meaning, any honest plaindealing man, that should read him only upon those words of this text, would easily be persuaded: howbeit, in the process or sentence against the wicked, ver. 41, he expressly unsays the most part of that which he here seems to say; being thereto enforced by the real circumstances of the text. He ingenuously acknowledgeth what Origen and Chrysostom had observed before him, that our Saviour saith unto those on his right hand, *Come, ye blessed of my Father;* but unto those on his left hand, though he say, *Depart, ye cursed,* yet he saith not, *ye cursed of my Father.*

This implies, as Jansenius acknowledgeth, that God the Father is the author and donor of everlasting bliss; but every one that doth wickedly is the author

of his own woe, or cursed estate. God then, not our works, is the cause of our bliss or salvation; men's evil works, not God, is the cause of damnation.

Again, in the other sentence of condemnation, our Saviour doth not say that the everlasting punishment is prepared for unrighteous men, but *for the devil and his angels.*

What doth this in the judgment of Jansenius imply?

First, that the condemnation of men is not so to be ascribed unto the ordinance of God as men's salvation is: for God created no man to the end that he should perish: but men by their freewill, or wilfulness in sin, do make themselves liable or obnoxious to those torments which principally were *prepared for the devil* 602
and his angels. For this reason, saith the same Jansenius, Christ doth not say, that the kingdom unto which he calls the righteous was prepared for the good angels, as the fire is prepared for the devil and bad angels, lest we should hence collect that men might by good works deserve or merit the society of good angels, after the same manner that they do merit the company or fellowship of evil angels or devils. For, as he adds, "the merits or good works of men do not depend only upon our freewill, but they issue from the grace and bounty of God." And our Saviour, (as this author concludes,) in saying "that this kingdom was prepared for the righteous, since, or from, the foundation of the world," and in saying, "hell was not prepared for wicked men, but *for the devil and his angels*," doth hereby give us to understand that the salvation of the righteous is to be ascribed unto the mercy of God, and the condemnation of the unjust, not unto God, but unto their own iniquity.

10. But doth not this plainly contradict his former assertion upon the text, when he saith, *Justi suis*

operibus merentur vitam æternam, sicut impii suis operibus æternum merentur supplicium: "that the righteous deserve eternal life by their works, as well, or after the same manner, that the wicked by their works deserve hell?"

All that can be said for him, or for his acquittal from contradicting himself, is, that he put no set quantity to his first proposition, but leaves it indefinite: a fault common to the Romanists, that they may have some excuse for their palpable contradictions. To say, that good works deserve heaven, even as bad works deserve hell, and to deny that the one deserves heaven as well as the other deserves hell, seems to imply a contradiction. Yet if any man should press Jansenius too far upon these terms, he hath this evasion; *non omnino similiter merentur;* the one doth not merit heaven altogether by the same manner that the other doth merit hell; because men's good works or merit do not depend only upon the freedom of will. But this favourable construction being permitted or allowed him, yet to say, as he doth, that the best works of men (how much or how little soever they depend upon man's freewill) do in any sort, either in whole or in part, merit the kingdom of heaven, this directly contradicts his former assertion, that *totum deputandum est misericordiæ Dei,* "that all is to be imputed to the mercy of God:" *quod totum est a Deo, non potest vel in parte ascribi meritis nostris;* "that which is wholly from God's mercy cannot so much as in part or at all be ascribed unto our merits." For what is the reason why the first grace cannot (in their doctrine) be merited? is it not because it is wholly from the mercy of God? Now if this kingdom of heaven or man's salvation be wholly from the mercy of God, it can no more be merited by any increase of

grace or good works, than the first grace itself can be merited.

11. But what shall we punctually answer to the grammatical inference drawn from the form of our Saviour's speech, *inherit the kingdom*, &c., FOR *I was an hungred, and ye gave me* &c.?[a] The usual answer is, that this conjunction or illative, *for*, *because*, and the like, do not always denote the cause of the thing itself, but sometimes only the consequence of what is spoken. But seeing the form of this speech is, as grammarians speak, causal; to say that a conjunction causal doth not always import some cause, were to deny principles, and affirm that the grammar rule were to be corrected. But admitting that this conjunction doth always import some cause; it will not hence follow that it always imports the real cause of 603
the thing itself which is known, but oftentimes the cause only of our knowledge of it. Again, such causal particles do not always import some efficacious causality, but only *causam sine qua non*, some necessary means, or condition, without which the prime and principal cause (especially if it work freely) doth not produce its intended effect.

To give you examples or instances of these observations. If a stranger coming into a city should say, 'Surely yonder gentleman is the chief magistrate, because the sword is borne before him;' no wise man would hence collect that the bearing of the sword before him is the cause why he is the chief magistrate; for his lawful election is the cause of that, and that is the cause why the sword is borne before him. Yet may we not for this reason deny that the former

[a] See the 27th chapter of this book, where this argument is most fully answered, and that with some variation of what is here.

speech doth necessarily import a cause; for the bearing of the sword before him is the true cause of his knowing him to be the chief magistrate. And inasmuch as we oftentimes come to know the cause by the effect, this word *for*, or other conjunction causal, doth ofttimes point out the effect, rather than the cause of the thing itself. So it doth in the speech of our Saviour, Luke vii. 47, *Wherefore I say unto thee, Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much.* However, some Romanists, whose delight it is to set Christian charity and faith at odds, would hence collect that charity is the cause of the forgiveness of sins; yet their greatest scholars acknowledge their error or oversight, and ingenuously acknowledge (their understanding being convinced by the evidence of truth) that this woman's love was not the cause why her sins were forgiven; but that the free forgiveness of her sins, which were many, was the true cause why she loved so much: however, her extraordinary love being testified in such solemn sort, was a true cause or reason, by which all that saw her might know both that her sins had been many, and that she had an internal feeling or apprehension of their forgiveness. And the true reason why the Pharisee did neither bear such love unto our Saviour, nor exhibit the like signs of respect unto him, was because he did not feel himself sick, much less did he feel or apprehend the cure of sickness, as the woman did. For if he had known either the measure of his own sins, or that our Saviour was the physician of his soul, he would have given better testification of his love and respect unto him, than he did by a complimental invitation of him.

12. To instance again. If of two parties equally suspected of felony a man admitted to hear their exa-

mination or trial should say, 'This is the thief, for two competent witnesses have given evidence against him,' no man would hence infer, that the evidence given in against him by two honest men was the cause why he was a thief, and yet was it the true cause why he knew him to be the thief.

Every revelation or authentic declaration of any truth before unknown, is the true cause of our knowledge of it, but not of the truth itself; for that is the cause why the declaration or our knowledge of it is true. Now amongst such as profess Christ, and call him Lord, it is unknown to us who be the true heirs of this heavenly kingdom, who be not: but in the day of final judgment, in which all shall be judged by their works, the sheep shall be known from the goats; and the first certain knowledge which we shall have of this difference shall be from the declarative sentence of the Judge, who cannot err; and his declaration, as you see, shall be made *according to their works:* the one's performance of the good works here mentioned, declared, and testified by the Judge, shall be the true cause by which men and angels shall know them to be heirs of the everlasting kingdom; the other's 604
omission of the like works, testified likewise by the same Judge, shall be the true cause by which we shall know them to be altogether unworthy of God's favour or mercy, most worthy of everlasting death. We shall then truly know that the one sort are crowned, as St. Cyprian saith, "according to God's grace," and that the other are condemned according to justice: that the one's omission of good works is the true cause of condemnation, and that the other's performance of good works is not the cause of their salvation, but the declaration only, or a testimony that they are the sons of God, and that they did good works by the secret

operation of the Spirit of grace in them. And thus much, if you observe it, is implied in the reply or answer of them that be saved, to their Judge, *Lord, when saw we thee an hungred*, &c.? So far they shall be from conceiting their works to be meritorious, or worthy of eternal bliss, that they shall be ready to disclaim them, as not worthy of it; ready to blame their sluggish backwardness, or want of cheerfulness to have done much better, seeing what they did unto their poor brethren (as now they perceive) shall be so graciously accepted, that Christ, in his throne of majesty, will acknowledge that he takes them as kindly as if they had been done unto himself.

The case is the same as if a gracious prince, of his own free motion and goodness, should proclaim a general pardon to a multitude of rebels, thieves, and traitors, so they would accept of it, and make their peace with their honest neighbours whom they have wronged. All of them in show accept the pardon, but some of them in the interim secretly practise treason, or disturb the public peace. If at the general assize, or at their arraignment, the judge, upon certain notice of their several demeanours, should say to the one sort, 'I restore you to your former state and dignity, because since the proclamation of your pardon you have demeaned yourselves as becomes loyal subjects and thankful men;' and to the other, 'You I condemn to death, because you have abused your sovereign's clemency;' no man would ascribe the restauration of the one unto their good demeanour in the interim betwixt the getting of their pardon and their arraignment, but unto the prince's clemency; albeit the condemnation of the other were wholly to be ascribed unto their misdemeanours, not unto any want of clemency in the prince towards them The good de-

meanour of the one could but be at the most, *causa sine qua non*, a necessary condition, without which the prince's clemency, in his pardon expressed, could not profit them. And so we say of good works, they are *causæ sine quibus non*, necessary conditions or means, without which no man shall inherit the kingdom of heaven; but no positive or meritorious causes of our inheritance in it.

To conclude: if any one should ask me, why all men that profess they believe in Christ shall not be saved, albeit Christ died for all, albeit the pardon general be proclaimed to all? the best cause or reason I could render, would be this: Because all that profess they believe in Christ do not truly believe in him; for if they did, they would be careful to maintain good works, and glorify God by being fruitful in them.

END OF VOL. X.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01195 5053